

International Review

VOL. 1 NO. 3

APRIL 1936

C

SOVIET GOLD

WHAT NOW IN SPAIN?

BEHIND THE KILLINGS IN TOKYO

THE YOUNG JAPANESE ARMY

THE BRAZILIAN REVOLUTION REPORTS

WILL THE DUCE BE SHELVED?

THE LABOR MOVEMENT IN BELGIUM

DAVID FRANKFURTER—MURDERER OR HERO

NAZI CONCENTRATION CAMPS FOR WOMEN

SOUVARINE'S "STALIN". A Summary.

TRADE UNIONS, "SOCIAL CONTROL", SOCIALISM

WAR—A NEW SOCIAL ORDER; D'ANNUNZIO

SERENADES THE DUCE

A. Serebrovsky

Roberto

Karl Radek

Andree Viollis

Luis Machado

Guissan

I. Mett

E. Petrini

Kaete Kenta

Magdeleine Paz

Rosa Luxemburg

THE WORLD'S MOST SIGNIFICANT THOUGHT AND ACTION

Behind the Killings in Tokyo

• Karl Radek

From "Izvestiya," Moscow, U.S.S.R.:

THERE IS NO DOUBT that the court and bureaucracy of Japan see only one solution to the present crisis: the conquest of a great Asiatic empire. There is disagreement on the details of this vast plan: the rhythm of its realization, delays, strategic problems.

These differences have led to the formation of two opposing tendencies. The first is that of the Minister of Finance Takahashi, who has the confidence of the financial circles as well as that of Prince Saionji, one of the founders of the empire and the dean of the emperor's counsellors. This group possesses a certain number of partisans in the army, especially among the older generals. It is opposed by the group directed by General Araki, by Mazaki and by Koiso. Although power rests nominally in the hands of the old generals who declare themselves to be neutral, the latter do not dare to head an energetic struggle against the partisans of General Araki. On the other hand, up to now, the latter did not dare to make a direct attack against the supporters of Takahashi and Saionji, fearing the popular indignation that might arise at the news of the suppression of the emperor's counsellors. The war prepared by the generals can only be carried on under the direction of the emperor. It was therefore impossible to begin with the assassination of his counsellors.

But these were altogether too subtle considerations for the youngest of the conspirators, who accused General Araki and his friends of indecision.

The members of the secret organization could develop their activity, as their terrorist acts received very light punishment and served to confer on them the aureole of patriotic heroes. Shooting His Imperial Majesty's ministers therefore became the preferred and least dangerous sport in Japan.

The recent events were provoked by an error on the part of the directors of the Japanese fascist movement. They had promised to the youth a decisive victory in the elections. The Nipponese parliament does not exercise a great influence, but by obtaining an electoral majority, the military would have been able to accede to power without internal convulsions. The militarists and the nationalist-reactionaries of the Seiyukai party therefore formed an electoral bloc. After having stigmatized this party as an instrument of capitalist corruption, the heads of the army came to an agreement with Seiyukai and multi-millionaire Kikara to establish a parliamentary government. But the Seiyukai party suffered a defeat in the elections as a result—and that is important—of the growth of the popular anti-militarist movement. Admiral Okada and the Minister of Finance Takahashi had adopted anti-fascist slogans. The victory of the lefts, and especially of the worker and peasants organizations, announced the near end of the present political monopoly.

Disappointed by the results of the elections, the conspirators resorted to force. They were convinced that the financial and military circles would not dare to combat them with arms.

In order to justify the annexation of Manchuria, the Japanese

militarists declared again and again that China was not a real State, that its government was incapable of assuring order over its entire territory. The Nipponese militarists concluded that history had assigned them the task of establishing order in China and in entire Asia. However, when we apply the same considerations to Japan, we arrive at a result that is the very opposite of what the Japanese claim for themselves. The Japanese government is not successful in obtaining the obedience of its own soldiers within the confines of its own country, in the occupied regions as well as in Tokyo.

The Japan that offers to reestablish order in Asia offers the spectacle of an extraordinary semi-feudal, semi-fascist anarchy. The importance of the present events is very great. We are not dealing here with a simple incident but with profound contradictions that tend to become more aggravated.

• Capt. Malcolm Kennedy

From "Morning Post," London:

IN CONSIDERING the news of Tokyo's latest outrage, it is essential to realize that this is not a "military coup" in the generally accepted meaning of the term. The present plot, as have been all save one of the many similar plots in recent years, was led by a junior Army officer. Responsible officers of the Army and Navy will be among the first to condemn it.

Ever since the opening of the trouble in Manchuria in September, 1931, groups of excitable young officers have opposed the Government at every turn in the hope of obtaining more money for the Defense Services, and of forcing a more vigorous diplomatic policy, especially in regard to China. The unfortunate handling of the China situation at Geneva strengthened the hands of these groups and secured widespread sympathy among the people of Japan.

It is important to realize that the present outrage is in no way anti-monarchical, being, indeed, quite the reverse. The plot is, however, anti-capitalist and anti-political—an attempt to return to the conditions of archaic times when the Emperor was the father of his people, leading an almost patriarchal existence. Behind the plotting is a hazy and strange ideology, very difficult for the Western mind to understand, which seeks a return to conditions of two thousand years ago.

There is, however, a close link with the present economic conditions of the country. About 80 percent of the Army of all ranks is recruited from the peasant class. For years the peasantry has been taxed and oppressed, while industry has been fostered with subsidies and other help. The majority of the Army, with a peasant origin, accordingly hates capitalist industry and the politicians, who are regarded as responsible for favoring that industry at the expense of the peasant.

It has been suggested that the new outbreak may precipitate war between Soviet Russia and Japan. This I do not believe. Tension, it is true, already exists between the two countries, but neither is ready for immediate hostilities. Russia wishes to complete her Five Year Plan, and Japan must consolidate her position in Manchukuo before she is prepared for war.

The Young Japanese Army

• Andree Viollis

From "Vendredi", Paris, France.

THE RECENT MILITARY coup in Tokyo unrolled exactly as one of those classic Nipponese plays called Kabuki. Nothing was missing: ambushes, assassinations, skirmishes, collective suicide, where in concession to modernity, the revolver took the place of the curved harakiri saber. Then the sudden resurrection of Prime Minister Okada, for whom had substituted himself—in the spirit of family and patriotic sacrifice—a brother in law whose like is not found in our country. Everything swam in the very Japanese atmosphere of heroism, horror and blood. I can almost hear the yelps and frightful roars by which the populace witnessing the Kabuki tragedies show their appreciation of the very ferocious episodes.

TO UNDERSTAND this drama it is necessary to know how the minds of the officers of the young Japanese army are formed. We must know also the causes of their discontent.

Japanese officers are recruited from all the classes of the nation: small bourgeois, peasants, sometimes, workers. A goodly number, however, are descendants of the ancient samurais, the warriors who attached themselves in the service of the great feudal chieftains, the daimios. Their families have preserved a liking for the use of arms and the cult of the past. Most of them have fallen into poverty.

The Japanese child that aspires to a military career must be particularly gifted. He must work harder than his comrades and pass a scare some series of examinations and elimination contests. Contrary to what is to be noticed in most countries, the young men who succeed in becoming officers in Japan form the intellectual élite of their country.

From childhood, they receive an education penetrated with patriotism, and submit to a rigorous discipline. Finally, during the four years of military school, they are impregnated to the marrow of their bones with the *bushido* code. The name of this barbarous heroic code signifies "the way of the warrior." It is really a new religion dating from the beginning of the twentieth century. It imposes on its followers the cult of the Emperor, the descendant of the Sun, the incarnation and symbol of the fatherland. *Bushido* exacts the same fanatical devotion to the Emperor that the samourai of old bore to his daimio. *Bushido* decrees the return to the ancient simplicity of life and heart, a contempt for money and worldly goods, and the spirit of total sacrifice to the dynasty and country. It is unnecessary to speak here of courage and disdain of death. Japanese honor is a terrible tyrant. According to it, an officer must succumb under the enemy's blows. Or if he falls in the enemy's hands, he may not survive his disgrace.

Such are the principles under which the young officers are brought up. Add to this the fact that nearly all are born in poor families, and are poor themselves. From the rank of sub-lieutenant to that of captain, their pay ranges from 550 to 1210 francs a month. Early marriage is the rule in Japan. So that nearly all have a wife and several children at the age of 20 to 25. Moreover, in the provincial garrisons where they begin their service, they enter in close contact with the poverty of the small bourgeoisie and the frightful distress of the peasants. They become acquainted with the exploitation suffered by the workers, who are deprived

of any protective legislation as a result of the selfishness of their employers. Later, the best of these officers are sent to Tokyo, either for garrison duty or to take courses at the war school. Now life is expensive in the capital. Their privations are doubled. They elbow plutocrats whose luxury astonishes and irritates them. Bankers and heads of industry. They become indignant. They, therefore, blame the deputies and the moneyed men for the great suffering of the people of Nippon. They dream of a return to the customs of old Japan, to the golden age of Nara, when the Emperor surrounded by his samourais ruled over his people without any intermediary.

BUT EVEN GRAVER is their discontentment with the management of the country's foreign affairs. We must return to the revolution of 1868 to discern its causes. Formerly the army always constituted the dominant class. When Emperor Meiji decided to open the country to Western ideas and visitors, his counsellors and close associates were the generals and admirals who had helped him to abolish the feudal clan of the *shoguns* and to regain his sovereignty. But little by little, with the development of the parliamentary and constitutional regime, the military men found themselves replaced by civilians, many of whom come from the merchant class, which formerly was placed below the peasants and artisans. This was a disgrace that wounded the officers, proud in their passionate fidelity to the emperor.

It is to this influence of "civilians and money men" that they attribute the defeat of their militarist policy and the successive humiliations which, according to them, Japan has suffered from the 1894-1895 war with China to the present moment. There is, for example, the Washington Naval Conference and the two London conferences, at which, the officers believe, their country lost its prestige as a naval power of the first rank. Two Council presidents, Minister Hara after the Washington conference and M. Hamaguchi after the London conferences, paid with their lives for this supposed outrage.

Because the malcontents in the army have now belonged for a number of years to the various societies, which are said to be secret but are known to everybody. The *Black Dragon* and the *League of the Blood Brotherhood* are only two of many organizations where plots are hatched and assassinations prepared. These societies draw up black lists made up of the names of those who, for various reasons, are considered by the members to be enemies of the country. These organizations base themselves 1. on the enormous Association of Former Soldiers, which has about four million adherents forming a close network over the entire country, and 2. on the large number of nationalist associations, which have altogether about 800,000 members, are composed of diverse social elements but agree on the need of pushing forward the expansion of Japan and its hegemony over China with the greatest speed possible.

WE GATHERED HOW great is their influence from the enthusiasm that burst out in Japan at the close of 1931 when the army suddenly occupied Manchuria, without waiting for orders from the Tokyo government. The latter had to resign and was replaced by a Seiyukai minister, a member of the conservative party of which general Sadao Araki has become the dominant

personality. Singled out by the emperor, he was always the favorite of the young army, its chief and defender. He supported the army in the struggle it carried on against the generals of the old school and openly took its side at the time of the Manchurian events. He incarnates all the preferred qualities of the Japanese soldier: courage, love for hard work and simplicity. Convinced of the divine mission of Japan and its right to conquest and supremacy, he wrote, in August 1932, in *Kaikosha*, the great monthly review of the Military Club:

Our country is determined to propagate its national ideal on the seven seas, in order to extend and spread it over the five continents of the earth. . . *We are the descendants of the gods. We ought to rule the world.*

Like his young officers, he does not respect politicians and capitalists. One could see that much in the indulgent sympathy he showed to the murderers of M. Inouye (the Finance Minister who preceded M. Takahashi), the murderers of Baron Dan, the director of the great Mitsui trust and, several months later, on May 15, 1932, to the murderers of Prime Minister Inukai.

I WAS THEN IN TOKYO. On a fine May Sunday, several groups of young men in army and navy uniforms tried to seize the central telegraph and telephone station and kidnap several ministers. Then they broke into Minister Inukai's office. A pathetic scene took place. The old man knew the fate awaiting him, but he kept his calm and dignity. The young men hesitated, held back by their victim's courage and the traditional respect for old men. But the minister fell under the conspirators' revolver fire.

What did they find blameworthy in him? Merely his attachment to the parliamentary regime and his lukewarm attitude to the army's projects of conquest.

The trial of the young assassins dragged on for two years. The directly guilty ones were sentenced to five years of prison. The sentence was shortened. The others were given a few months. Several were dispatched to the army in Manchuria, which was what they wanted most.

"All have been promised a fine future," one of my Japanese friends told me.

Another said: "Believe me, the era of political assassinations is not over."

THESE WERE PROPHETIC words. This time, however, the uprising of the young army was not only due to the negative conclusion of the London Conference, or the opposition shown by certain members of the government, especially Takahashi, to the constant increase of the army and navy budget, or even to the results of the elections, which gave the majority to the liberals. The reasons for the uprising seemed particularly military.

Last year, the Minister of War Hayashi became uneasy at the warlike and unruly spirit of the Kwantung army, and recalled from China a certain number of the most turbulent young officers, thus increasing the number of uniformed conspirators in Japan. He took this measure against the advice of General Mazaki, the director of military instruction and a great favorite with the army, who felt obliged to hand in his resignation.

Now General Nagata, assigned to the War Ministry, was said to be the instigator of these changes. That was enough. Last August, a young lieutenant-colonel by the name of Aizawa bought himself a short razor-edged sword. He prayed at the grave of the emperor Meiji and after introducing himself into General Nagata's office, called on him to resign. Then attacking the general with his sword, finished by nailing Nagata to the wall.

In the course of the trial that took place in Tokyo, the accused

and his defender, also a colonel, pronounced passionate diatribes against the group of old men who, according to them, stood in the way of the expansion and glory of Japan. They also attacked the financiers and the businessmen who enrich themselves by starving the people. They read various petitions, some of which were written by young officers in their own blood. They declared that tens among them were ready to complete the murderous act of purification undertaken by colonel Aizawa. The debates had created in the military circles an effervescence which was to hasten the explosion of the plot that was, no doubt, being prepared since a long time before.

WE SAW, AFTER the assassinations and the rebellious attempt, that it was General Araki (who had voluntarily left the War Ministry, no doubt as a result of resistance shown to his demands for military credits) who, together with his *alter ego* General Mazaki, carried on with the emperor negotiations in favor of the rebels. May we not conclude that the two idols of the young army were not at all ignorant of the plot?

Will the old statesmen, who have by miracle escaped the killing, —prince Saionji, the last of the *genros* (those wise counsellors of Meiji), admiral Okada, count Makino, baron Ikki, have the courage to oppose now the injunctions of the military party?

"Make no mistake. The entire army is behind the rebels," I was told by a French officer who has come back from two years in Japan. "And this army is impatient to throw itself into the 'inevitable war'—you guess against what power" . . .

Translated by S. N.

(The May issue of the *International Review* will contain a definitive study of the various Fascist and fascistoid groups and secret societies now infesting Japan.)

IN MAY NUMBER

Because we aim to bring before our readers the most recent important writing appearing in the worlds periodicals, we shall never be in the position to give in one issue a complete description of the contents of the next issue. However, it is certain that the May number will include the following articles, among others:

THE LAST MALRAUX

JAPANESE SECRET POLITICAL SOCIETIES

THE PRIVATE LIFE OF GENERAL GOERING

BEHIND FASCISM IN PARAGUAY

VALLE INCLAN AND HIS "ESPERPENTOS"

THE ROAD TO POWER By Jonathan Ayres

TWO INCIDENTS AT HOHENSTEIN

THE TRIAL By Ernst Toller

STREICHER'S PORNOGRAPHY

THE PRESENT STATE OF THE LABOR MOVEMENT
IN MEXICO

CZECHOSLOVAKIAN LITERATURE TODAY

FASCIST CORPORATISM: HISTORY AND PRACTICE

We wish to announce that René Meurant is now on the editorial staff of the *International Review*.

Omission: Article by Aragon in March issue was from "Commune," Paris.

Nazi Concentration Camps for Women

From "Neue Weltbühne," Praha, Czechoslovakia.

• Kaete Kenta

THE LEADERS of the National-Socialist Party planned concentration camps long before they came to power. They realized that the existing number of prisons would not suffice for their methods of government. And they suspected that the usual kind of penal institution would hardly deter opposition. A new punitive form had to be devised. The Nazi compounds came into being.

The world knows about the concentration camps for men. It knows nothing at all about the holes in which anti-Nazi women prisoners are penned. I have before me a report prepared by a young woman who has just been released from Camp Hohenstein.

The number of women whose political activity is feared by the Nazis is not large. Women's concentration camps have a special reason for being. Their occupants are held mostly as hostages for men relatives or friends who have escaped the doubtful blessings of the Third Reich or remain in hiding within the borders of Germany. The fugitives are naturally depressed when they learn that their wives, mothers, brides or sisters are in Nazi concentration camps. This is one of the delicate tricks practiced by the Gestapo in order to coax the anti-fascists into giving themselves up.

The women's section at Hohenstein contains forty-four prisoners. At the time when my reporter was there, the youngest inmates were two seventeen-year old girls, both members of the Communist Youth. After spending several months in the camp, the girls were brought before a Nazi tribunal and sentenced to two year's detention in a house of correction. The two oldest prisoners were both past seventy. Their crime consisted in belonging to a group of Bible students. The section also included three Social-Democrat or Communist functionaries, a former official of the National-Socialist Party who had fallen out of grace with the directors of her party when she uncovered a serious swindle, a woman of the streets, and two petty thieves. The rest were there as hostages for men whom the Nazis had not succeeded in arresting.

The prisoners' roster continues to change. Single women do not remain long in "protective" custody. As soon as the Gestapo has attained its aim—the voluntary appearance of the runaway man—or when it has become evident that no information can be drawn out of the woman, the prisoner is released in the same, apparently sudden and unmotivated, manner that marked the initial arrest.

The usual stay is six months long. The prisoners rarely supply to their torturers the desired information,—partly because they know little and partly because they are ready to bear any punishment to protect their loved ones. The chief purpose of the arrest is, however, to shatter the fugitive's will and belief, and here is the Gestapo nearly always successful.

THE PRISONERS come and go. Most of them are politically disinterested. They are kept together with female criminals. As a result, you do not find among them the mutual confidence and solidarity that are so evident in the men's compounds. The in-

mates watch every word of theirs, for the storm-troopers are ever ready to take advantage either of the chattering or fright of the women. There are always a few inmates who succumb. Some even permit themselves to have sexual intercourse with the SA men, because such women get better food and light work. These are feared by their companions as denouncers. Relations of this sort are usually discovered by the other prisoners. Care is taken that the possible informers get no material for reports to the authorities.

But as a rule, the prisoners are ready to help one another. Most of them understand they are fellow sufferers, that they must not add to the pain of their imprisonment. Consequently, hostility over party differences is almost entirely absent. Petty disputes are squelched immediately.

The inmates of the women's section have one never-exhausted topic of conversation—their fears and worries. All the prisoners try to share the cares of the mothers who have been separated from their children. One woman had three children, from two to six years of age. Her husband, a Social-Democratic functionary, was in hiding. The mother was told that her children had been placed in a Home. She received no other news from them during her term at Hohenstein.

THE LODGINGS are extremely uncomfortable. Benches with straw sacks piled in two rows, a long table and some cots comprise the furniture. There are no closets. The clothing hangs on nails. All other belongings are shoved under the cots. The windows of the dormitories open into the drill yard, so that the women can witness the tortures borne by the men prisoners.

The women's section has no female supervisors. The prisoners are guarded by the SA, who have access to the prisoners' quarters day and night. The work hours are from seven to twelve and from one to six. Most of the inmates are employed in the camp laundry, where they wash for the men's section, which holds more than a thousand prisoners. So that the forty-four women at Hohenstein do the washing for a thousand to twelve hundred prisoners and for the three to five hundred members of the garrison. The work is, consequently, very strenuous. But more feared is the threat of being detailed to clean the rooms occupied by the SA men. The presence of a woman prisoner in the storm-troopers' rooms is usually an occasion for cruel, insulting rough-play and sometimes violence. During the period dealt with in this report, a girl was attacked by the SA man who was substituting for the overseer of the camp. Later, when her condition became too noticeable, she was taken out of the concentration camp and put in a regular prison. Nothing more was heard of her. Her attacker remained in charge of the camp.

The oldest women and those who have been especially weakened by ill treatment remain in the common hall to do patchwork. The food is, of course, insufficient for the hard work done. The food packages sent to the inmates by their relatives are opened by the SA jailors. Most of the contents of these gifts usually disappear during the examination.

Once a month each prisoner may receive a visitor for ten min-

utes,—naturally, under supervision. But most prisoners hail from localities far from Hohenstein. The short monthly visits become quite impossible.

AFTER SUPPER, the women remain together. They are permitted to converse till ten o'clock. But it is then that the individual interrogations by the authorities take place. During the day the women are occupied with their task. Fear falls on the women's section when an inmate is led off to the gruesome examination. The SA treat the women prisoners as they do the men. Cruel torture and beating are common. One woman who refused to disclose her husband's hiding place, and was consequently beaten unmercifully, suffered a concussion of the brain.

And the women prisoners are not spared the notorious "Stehbunker", a dark hole in which one is obliged to remain standing without being able to move. The twenty-two year old girl who has furnished me this data spent six days in the "Bunker". The unfortunates held there get only bread and water.

The Nazi youths punch and slap the women during the interrogation. They waste no pity on old women. The young women, however, fear the blows much less than the caresses of their

torturers. The SA men pinch them, reach under their clothing and treat them with the foulest profanity.

At ten o'clock the lights go out. Then comes the dreaded night "control". By that hour, the storm-troopers are pretty well drunk. The sufferings of the women prisoners during the nightly visits are indescribable. Their beds are placed four or five together. Then comes a narrow space and then another row of beds. The women occupying the middle cots cannot get into bed from the side, they must clamber over other sleepers. Yet the center beds are always preferred. Their occupants are more secure against the night attacks of the troopers.

During the first days of the Nazi rule, the attention of world opinion was drawn to the imprisonment as hostages of the wives of several known anti-Nazis. But these were not and are not rare cases. The system of arrest as hostages has been in effect in Germany for the last three years. Politically disinterested and innocent women and children are tortured because they refuse to betray their men relatives.

Translated by O. G.

You Can Save Them!

The treatment of the women in the concentration camp at Hohenstein is revoltingly brutal. There are, however, even more pitiable cases. Innocent women have been kept imprisoned for years, and their families do not know where they are, or if they are still alive. The following are five instances about which we have definite information. They are typical. Their exact number is unknown but it is, without doubt, very great.

Else Steinfurth: Her husband was arrested by the Gestapo at the beginning of 1934. Suddenly she, too, was taken into custody. A few days after her arrest, she was brought to a cemetery, where, she was told, she would witness the burial of her husband, who (this was, of course, unknown to her) had already been tortured to death by the police. She suffered a nervous breakdown, recovered, and was then accused of having conspired, with her husband, against the Government. She is still held a prisoner in the concentration camp at Mohringen.

Maria Dengler: Frau Steinfurth's sister. Arrested and held as hostage under the same circumstances and for similar reasons during the last three years.

Senta Beimler: She was arrested immediately after her husband had escaped from the concentration camp at Dachau in April 1933. She is still being held in the Stadelheim jail near Munich.

Frau Mueller: Wife of Franz Mueller, who fled to Czechoslovakia. Arrested January 1935 in Chemnitz and held since then as a hostage by the police of this city. Forced by torture to write to her husband, urging him to return and threatening to divorce him unless he complied. Has four children, ranging in age from 6 to 12, whom she is not permitted to see and who depend on the charity of very poor friends for their existence.

Frau Klaus: Husband executed on the block for distributing in Germany money collected abroad for the relief of

families of Nazi victims. Arrested three weeks after husband's execution and is now a prisoner in the concentration camp in Mohringen, no reason being given for her incarceration.

The one way of obtaining the release of the unfortunate victims of Nazi Barbarism is by protests from abroad and by sending a delegation of Americans to approach the German Government in Berlin. This method was successful in the Seger case in 1934.

In December 1933, Gerhart Seger, a former member of the Reichstag, escaped from the notorious concentration camp of Oranienburg into Czechoslovakia. His wife and two-year-old child were immediately arrested and thrown into the concentration camp at Rossau to be held as hostages in order to compel the return of her husband from his place of refuge abroad. Aroused by the barbarous, medieval measures taken by the German Government against defenceless and innocent women and children, the womanhood of England arose in indignant protest and prevailed upon Lady Astor to go to Germany and effect the rescue of Mrs. Seger. The reunited Seger family is now living in New York City.

A Dutch delegation is at present in Germany making all efforts to see Frau Klaus and obtain her freedom.

The *Wendekreis*, a non-partisan and non-sectarian group of liberal German-Americans and Americans of German descent, is at present endeavoring to follow the example of the English and Dutch women. It is their intention to arouse American womanhood to act along the same lines. All persons interested in participating in this noble work are asked to communicate immediately with:

Der Wendekreis, Rm. 442, 80 E. 11th St., N. Y. C.

The organization will furnish speakers or any other aid in the cause of rousing the public opinion of America to a task it cannot slight.

The Brazilian Revolution Reports

• Luis Machado

From "Machete", Mexico.

LET US BEGIN with a brief review of the revolutionary drive of the days of November 22-27, fix its historical significance, define the present situation and consider the outlook for the future.

Chronologically, the struggle spread as follows: November 22, at Natal (Rio do Norte); the 23d, Recife (Pernambuco); the 27th, Rio de Janeiro. Now while the Natal and Recife movements were planned, the Rio movement was a spontaneous drive in support of the struggles in the Northwest. To understand the situation, the three must not be taken as individual outbreaks but as a single united revolutionary effort.

Who took part in the uprising?

In Natal and Recife, workers, soldiers, plain folk and small bourgeoisie; in Rio, armed forces primarily, the officers and non-commissioned officers of the Third Infantry Regiment and the Aviation School distinguishing themselves for their daring and heroism.

The aim and purpose of the movement was essentially to force the demand of L. C. Prestes and the A. N. L. for a national people's government. At Natal the revolutionaries, after several hours' fighting, succeeded in capturing power and organizing and maintaining a people's government for four days.

The struggle was launched in the Northwest. This is no surprise to persons familiar with Brazilian affairs who could see that that section of Brazil had attained a high point in its ripeness for revolution. Recent events became clear in the light of what came before. There were constant strikes in Rio Grande do Norte throughout 1935. In the strike of October 15—November 15 over 150,000 workers participated. There were strikes also in Espiritu Santo, Bahia and Recife. Sometimes they were general strikes, waged against the *integralistas*, who had planned two regional congresses. Recife witnessed a strike on the great Western Railway in which women fought with their menfolk, and even children took part. The police proving unable to handle the situation, the government sent in troops who, however, fraternized with the strikers, mutinied, supplied army provisions to the workers and by force of arms set 300 prisoners free. The regional commander appealed to Rio, stating that unless the troops were changed he could guarantee nothing.

Of these strikes, both political and economic, the greater number were won, backed as they were by determination, popular support and overt fraternization between workers and troops.

The great Western strike was at its height when the outbreaks occurred at Rio Grande do Norte and Pernambuco.

So much for the strike situation.

NOW, AS REGARDS the general political situation surrounding the revolutionary outbreak, it can be described as follows. President Getulio Vargas, whose position had been shaky right along, had been trying to get wider support, and so announced the idea of a parliamentary government with ministers responsible to the Chamber, in the hope of winning over the parliamentary minority to the support of his cabinet. In this he failed. A new parliamentary group then came to the fore, in behalf of democratic liberties. This new group consisted of perhaps forty deputies both from the majority and the minority. Turning to account the disharmony

in the enemy camp, this group forced through a vote over the head of Getulio calling for dissolution of the *integralistas*. The government of Rio Grande do Sur, one of Getulio's main supports, broke with him. In most states, after serious fighting, two governments claimed control, notably in Maranhao. Getulio turned more and more toward a sterner dictatorship, hand-in-glove with the *integralistas*, and approved the plan of the chief of staff, Genl. Pantaleon Pessoa, an *integralista*, to dismiss a large number of officers, non-commissioned officers and soldiers, and consolidate the army and the military police (militia) of the individual states. Together with the *integralistas* he hoped to have a broader base for action. From the situation as it then presented itself there is no doubt but that at the moment of insurrection Getulio had in mind adopting more terroristic methods to wipe out every vestige of democratic strength in the army.

THE EVENING OF November 22, the population of Natal arose, in unison with the soldiers of the 21st Battalion of Sharpshooters. The police were overpowered, Governor Fernandez escaped and a people's government was formed. Its members were Lauro Lago, José Praxedes, a shoe worker, José Macedo, a post office employee, Juan B. Zalvaio and Sergeant Quintin. They broadcast nationwide appeals, calling upon the people to revolt, for the program of the A.N.L. and under the banner of Luis Carlos Prestes. They printed a government paper, (*A Libertade*), signed decrees punishing persons guilty of spreading terrorist rumors and warned store keepers that any who attempted to close their stores to starve out the population would suffer confiscation of their property. The first issue of *A Libertade* enumerated the tasks of the new government in fighting against the imperialists and the large landowners, and on behalf of democratic liberties.

With the forces of Rio Grande do Norte alone Getulio was unable to control the situation. He at once dispatched troops from the neighboring states as well as cruisers (divided between Natal and Recife) and aircraft. By this concentration of forces Getulio succeeded in defeating the people's government of Natal, which after putting up resistance were taken into custody on the 27th and 28th. Only Praxedes succeeded in getting away, to join, it is believed, the 500 who fled from Natal into the interior.

AT RECIFE, the fighting started on the 23rd, the 29th Infantry Battalion (Sharpshooters) lending a hand. The people's forces secured control of Olinda (the well-to-do section of the city), but as the revolutionists did not have the support of the militia, the fighting grew more tense. Getulio sent planes, and general Rabello, dropping his democratic mask, undertook to crush the revolution. The other states also sent down forces, in particular Juracy Magalhaes, governor of Bahia.

From this point on the combat was an uneven one, with the revolutionists at a disadvantage. They accordingly joined a column and under the command of Cayetano, a worker, and Muñiz de Faria, an officer, retreated into the country. Sillo Meirelles, leader of the Recife insurrection, had been taken prisoner.

AT RIO, the revolutionists were faced with this question: How could they give help to the struggle that was still in progress in the North? At the instance of Getulio, a state of war had been

declared, troops were quartered in the city and workers and Aliancistas were being arrested en masse. Only an armed uprising, with the odds against them, was possible. But the government was prepared. On the 27th at three in the morning, fighting broke out simultaneously at the School of Aviation and the Third Infantry Regiment. The fighting in Rio proved two things: first the revolutionary abnegation of the officers and the determination of the soldiers. The fighting at the Aviation School developed into a hard battle, as the School's insurgents had to fight their own schoolmates as well as the forces sent up from the city. The revolutionists put up a tough fight, but after six hours they surrendered. Their leader, Captain Socrates, escaped.

The position of the Third Regiment, cornered in a remote part of the city, demanded an immediate march into the city; but this was rendered impossible by the fighting which broke out within the regiment itself. The government forces within the regiment, moreover, had the support of artillery which was concentrated in the vicinity. Only by carrying the fight beyond the city was there a way out. But this way was blocked. The 2,000 rebel soldiers performed miracles of heroism in the face of great odds, carrying on for seven hours. Credit for the splendid resistance which they put up is due to Captain Agildo Barata, whose firmness, courage and decision made him one of the best loved leaders of the national revolutionary movement. By noon the government had taken over the city.

As the revolutionaries of the regiment entered the city, prisoners, the population greeted them with apparent sympathy and admiration. The prisoners themselves showed no discouragement. On the contrary, all along their line of march they kept shouting vivas for the Revolution, the A.N.L. and Prestes and "Down with the imperialists! Down with their agent, Getulio!" As already mentioned, outstanding is the name of Agildo Barata, valiant leader of the insurrection and that of Sillo Meirelles, who are both in the first rank of the new revolutionary leaders.

Scattered strikes were carried on by the workers of Rio. On the outskirts workmen seized the police stations.

In the Rio fighting, the workers proceeded with caution and the general opinion is that had the revolutionaries of the Third Infantry been able to hold out till nightfall, the working population would have taken a vigorous part.

BUT IF RIO represents a defeat, it is a peculiar kind of defeat. Not one that runs deep or holds long. My own view is that had active fighting not broken out, the defeat would be a more serious one. The government has arrested 2,500 soldiers and officers. But it had already planned a thorough purging of the whole army. The struggle in Rio pointed the way to a nationwide movement, particularly in the Northwest and set hurdles in the path of the reaction. It enlisted new fighters in the struggle. The significance of the revolutionary struggle of November 22-27 is this: revolution is on the calendar and remains on the calendar. It marks out the path of liberation, with Natal, Recife and Rio as shining examples. It has brought into being the first reliable nucleus of a people's revolutionary army. It has provided new rank-and-file timber as well as new popular revolutionary leaders. It has revealed to the people of Brazil for the first time in their history what a people's government means. It has swept overboard the old vexed question of majority versus minority and set in full views of the whole Brazilian people the one true problem: to defeat imperialism. In his manifesto of November 28, Prestes said:

All these battles are outward evidence that in the struggle against imperialism and in behalf of our national liberation, the fundamental thing has moved on to a higher and more

decisive stage. But the enormous significance of the recent events is the open, decided and daring espousal of large sections of the national military forces of the cause of a revolution of liberation. This fact, whatever the lies and calumnies of the government, is indisputable and is known to all our country. For the first attempts to organize the nucleus of a people's revolutionary army we have had to pay with the blood of some of our most valiant fighters. But the Brazilian people have witnessed the sympathy and support which the soldiers have given to the revolution and are themselves thereby encouraged to take a revolutionary stand against the assassin government which they so detest. The present attempt, abortive as it is, will be followed by others and an effort will be made to organize a people's revolutionary army.

The recent heroic fight is the first symptom of a storm which is brewing. A revolutionary explosion is inevitable, and may be close at hand because the population all over the land, is unable longer to put up with imperialist domination and ever increasing misery. The revolution is ahead.

The heroic fighters who today went down to defeat will be the victors of tomorrow, because the whole Brazilian people are with them, as the whole people demand bread, land and liberty. The repressive measures of which they are now victims, the state of war which the government has declared, the *integralista* support given the Getulio government—these things can only serve to add to the bitterness felt against the assassins of the people and strengthen the spirit driving toward the emancipation of Brazil.

THERE IS REACTION, but there is also revolution. The strike wave cannot be stopped. The people have shown their support of the revolutionaries. The special measures which the government plans to aim at the revolutionaries can only increase the *Aliança* forces. The ruling groups are not in harmony among themselves. And inland, especially in the Northwest the fighting continues in the cities and will spread to the farmers.

The Brazilian revolution has gotten under way. Nothing can stop it.

Translated by L. Bertrand.

D'Annunzio Serenades the Duce

MAY EACH Italian bullet account for one dead man! Receive our laudations, O leader, for successfully inspiring our too long inert people with the will to accomplish such a great mission. Thanks to thee the entire nation today breathes deeply. Thanks to thee, everything is in animation. Thanks to thee, our country throbs to the beat of fate. For I know that even the destiny of a nation has its bronchia and pleura.

Why does Selassie's face incite me to so much hilarity? Set in its whiskers, it is like a vulgar religious image you see in provincial coffee-houses.

I have always honoured and sung the virtue of descent. But of what solemn origin can be that bearded poll stuck on the peak of a sort of draped bell? There is no rhetorical cliché more empty than Selassie's comical mantle.

... But Ethiopia has been Roman for centuries and centuries, as Roman as the Gaul of Julius Caesar, the Dacia of Trajan, and the Africa of Scipio.

Praises, O unforeseen chief of an acephalous Italy. Thanks to thee, Rome is being restituted to predestined Italy.

With joy I interpret today the ineffaceable: *Teneo te Africa. Alala!*

From "Popolo d'Italia"

Soviet Gold

• A. Serebrovski

From "Bolshevik", Moscow, U. S. S. R.

BY THE END of the year 1935, explorations had definitely established the fact that the Soviet Union possesses colossal reserves of gold, distributed among deposits which are scattered throughout the entire territory of the country, from the Pacific coast to Transcaucasia.

New deposits were continually being discovered, and this naturally became known abroad. In its issue of December 11, 1935, the *Manchester Guardian* commented on the subject in the following terms:

"People's Commissar for Heavy Industry Ordzhonikidze has issued an order initiating exploitation on an enormous scale of the larger deposits in the new auriferous regions. In connection with work in these new regions, there has arisen a demand for the most modern and highly perfected equipment."

The bourgeois press, as is usual in capitalist countries whenever new gold deposits are discovered, immediately raised a great noise about all this.

The authors of the articles dedicated to the growth of gold production in the USSR did not take into account the compelling circumstances that Soviet gold is not produced in a capitalist environment and does not serve the enrichment of a few bankers and speculators but serves the cause of building socialism. No "gold fevers" are taking place in our planned socialist economy, and none can ever possibly take place.

THINGS ARE different in America, where, for acquisitive purposes, romantic "gold fevers" have been and are still being cultivated.

In his book *Man and Metals*, T. A. Rickard quotes many instances of such "gold fever". One such instance occurred when gold deposits were discovered near the town of Virginia, and the exploitation of the so-called "Comstock Lode" began. Henry Comstock himself died a pauper. The town of Virginia had its boom, and now stands deserted, its houses boarded up. Those who profited were, of course, a handful of the most shameless and unscrupulous speculators, and bankers who had created this "gold fever". Nothing has remained from those days except George D. Liman's book, *The Saga of the Comstock Lode* and Mark Twain's cabin. Another instance occurred in California when gold was discovered in the upper reaches of the Sacramento River; tens of thousands of gold-seekers immediately rushed there; towns like Placerville, Marysville, Devil's Fork, Smith's Pocket and others with names no less "poetic" than these were founded. These times have been described in the book *Sutter's Gold*, as well as in numerous tales of Bret Harte's; these times ruined many, while creating the fortunes of Western magnates.

In 1897 began the Alaskan "gold fever"; the Klondike, Dawson, Forty Mile and other deposits were discovered. All this has been described by Jack London.

But all these tales of gold had running through them the common motive of "the impoverishment and destruction of the many and the enrichment of a handful of predatory animals".

It is otherwise with us, in the Soviet Union.

OUR GOLD INDUSTRY is a pioneer of Soviet culture in the most distant places of the Union. The workers of Soviet gold industry carry into the taiga Bolshevik culture, they carry with

them the teachings of Lenin and Stalin, the first and greatest humanists of our times. In the savage, distant taiga we build schools, hospitals, we establish telephonic and telegraphic communications, we lay down roads, we construct power and radio stations, etc.

Our scouts discover not gold alone; they seek and find also copper, iron, coal, petroleum. In the path of the scouts follow builders—there appear cities with electric lights, waterworks, clubs, theatres, brick houses and buildings; together with mines, factories, plants, there grow cities, railroads are extended, steamers ply the rivers. . . . However, none of our writers has as yet thematized this gigantic growth, none has described comrades Berzin (Kolyma), Bertin (Aldan), Selikhovkin, Ganin (Bodaibo), Novikov ("Darasun") and others, nor their self-denying accomplishments. In our country very little has been written of the achievements of gold industry, but abroad, as already noted, a great noise has been made.

Thus, for instance, we find the following in the economic review of the American magazine *Today* (July, 1935):

The recent excitement about Soviet gold had its origin in a late dispatch to the effect that during 1934, Russia has got together, by dint of mad washing and digging, more gold than the United States or Canada. Straining enormously all its resources, the USSR has occupied in this respect the second place in the world.

Toward the end of last year (i.e., 1934—A.S.), the number of Russians engaged in gold industry had increased to more than half a million. These men were working both in small cooperative (apparently *artel*—A.S.) groups and as employees of highly mechanized gold producing trusts, obtaining overwhelming quantities of gold.

They acquired the status of national heroes when the great Stalin himself commended them before the entire country for fulfilling the plan for gold production.

These are the facts which are hidden behind the 'Russian dream' of becoming the biggest gold-producing country in the world. Our engineers who have visited their mines and have inspected their new gold-bearing regions say that their ambitions are not in the least exaggerated.

Thus speak the American economists, and they find it entirely possible that Soviet gold industry may actually overtake that of Great Britain and its possessions, thus to occupy the first place in the gold-producing world.

What effect these developments have had upon the monetary and gold economy of the entire world, the American economists do not yet say much, but brokers and bankers are very excited.

THE PAGES OF financial papers are swarming with articles and notices concerning the fabulous growth of the Soviet gold industry. Characteristic is a long article which appeared in the *Wall Street Journal*, the organ of New York banks, on December 4, 1935. Under the heading: "Russian Gold Production Expected to Rise by 31% This Year, as Country Attempts to Overtake South Africa, Chief Gold Producer in World", the article continues: "The rates of increase in Russian gold production demonstrate the fact that the country is experiencing one of the greatest events in the history

of gold production, an event comparable in the final accounting only with the famous gold discoveries in California, the Klondike and South Africa." At the very end of the article, the highly respectable organ of the international bankers declares: "The Soviet Government has decided that Soviet production must overtake that of South Africa. At the present time, Russia occupies second place."

As is known, no such decision has been made by the Soviet authorities; there has appeared in our press, however, the report of the Stakhanovist conference at Sverdlovsk, at which it was proposed to overtake the gold production of the United Kingdom, thereby finally fulfilling the admonition of the great Stalin to quadruple our production.

The Ural workers' slogan was quickly taken up by the workers of all other gold-producing regions, and a series of regional conferences accepted concrete obligations, designed so as to increase the gold yield of every mine and field until, within two years at the latest, Britain and its possessions would be left behind.

THE IDEA OF conquering first place in the production of gold has grown out, elementally, from the very depths of Ural, Siberian, Yakut and Far Eastern Stakhanovite gold producers.

On January 4, 1936, the workers of our gold industry reported to the government, at a meeting held in the Kremlin, that we shall, in all probability, overtake England in 1937-1938, and thus shall occupy first place in the gold-producing world.

What, then, is England's reaction to this idea which has sprung from the broadest masses of the workers engaged in Soviet gold industry?

Whenever faced with adverse circumstances, the British, following an old habit carried over from Dickens' times, first of all begin to blame their government. On this occasion, too, public opinion is apprehensive lest the British Government may, perhaps, soon dream away England's first place in the production of gold.

Following is an excerpt from a letter written by E. Beliol Scott, editor of the oldest and most authoritative mining publication in England and in the entire world, the *Mining Journal*:

"In my position as the leader of a journal," he writes on December 10, 1935, "which primarily represents the interests of gold mining, I have with particular satisfaction observed the intensive measures applied by the Soviet Government to stimulate gold production to its utmost limits. I regret sharply the circumstance that within the confines of the British Empire a policy of excessive taxation upon gold mining and of the limitation of its possible development is so widely practiced."

THERE ARE IN our possession also many French papers in which engineers and economists note our successes with astonishment and even request that we may send our instructors and scouts to them, in order that they may help them find gold in Guiana, where they insist it must be present. An analogous request has been received from Roumania: our famous investigator, the geologist V. V. Selikhovkin, was invited there recently.

We have the reactions of the German press, as well... Dear readers, have you ever read the tales of Hoffman? I hope that you have; in that case, it is not necessary to annoy you with excerpts from the Fascist newspapers which become panic-stricken and nervous because of the "excessive growth" of gold production in the Soviet Union, thus, according to them, threatening the economic balance of the entire world.

LET US ONLY refer to the most serious notice in the journal *Metallwirtschaft*, No. 46, November 15, 1935. Joachim Fischer reports new Soviet records and the fact that the USSR has occu-

pied the second place in the world in the production of gold. Further, the article expresses dissatisfaction with the Soviets' energetic ambitions to raise gold-production, to overtake South Africa and to occupy first place in the world. However, the author of the article consoles himself, "the achievement of this must cost Russia great exertions; but even the position already attained represents the greatest significance in the monetary and gold economy not only of the USSR but of the entire world... The gold plans of the USSR will introduce a further disturbing factor into the international gold and currency situation which is now in any case very tense..."

IT IS TRUE, we are worried least of all about the introduction of disturbance among German bankers and speculators! After an inspection trip around the Ural enterprises, Comrade Ordzhonikidze has placed before us a fighting assignment—to struggle for the utilization of our reserves.

"What do we find?" asked Comrade Ordzhonikidze at the conference in September 1934, "We find that our reserves are very great... If we can bring these reserves into motion, if we can utilize them as we should, then we shall obtain a still greater growth in production than that which we have already achieved."

DURING THE conference at the Kremlin, Comrade Ordzhonikidze again returned to this question and again demanded from all workers in the gold industry complete mastery of equipment and the introduction of the most modern and efficient methods of work, of Stakhanovite principles of labor organization:

"We must approach the further growth of gold production fully armed with science and fully supplied with the best and most thoroughly trained engineers, technicians, economists, organizers."

It is just these factors which explain the successes of our gold industry: the best projects, the foremost technical ideas, the best engineers, economists, growing columns of Stakhanovites...

Translated by Alexander Bogrow.

"Socialism" Everywhere

From "Socialist Standard", London, England.

YEARS ago, Socialist propagandists used to point out to the reformists that their work of popularizing old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, etc., would only end up with the openly capitalist parties dishing them by adopting the proposals for themselves and getting the credit. To clinch the matter, Socialists added that a time would come when the capitalists would steal the word "Socialism" itself and use it to gain a further lease of life for capitalism. Events have faithfully followed this anticipation. If what they say were really true, the workers' difficulty today would be to find some spot where Socialism isn't. First, there are Russia's 170 millions supposed to be living under Socialism. Now Germany, with its "National Socialist Party" in the saddle, has just been officially declared to be Socialist. The Berlin correspondent of the *Economist* (February 1st) writes as follows: "... it is affirmed that Socialism is under way (indeed, this week it is officially stated to have already replaced capitalism)." Then the three Scandinavian countries, with their Labour Parties in power, are described as "Socialist" in the English Labour Press, along with New Zealand and Western Australia. At home we have the old-fashioned section of the Labour Party still insisting that the Post Office is Socialism, while the new gang (Mr. Morrison) calls the Transport Board "socialization," and tells us that we have a Socialist London County Council...

What Now in Spain?

• Roberto

THEY SAY the February elections were won by the 30,000 prisoners. By the prisoners and the memories of October, 1934.

The affair of the San Sebastian gambling casino helped. The two years of famine undergone by the peasants of Spain helped. The existence of a single "left" slate helped. What helped very much was the decision of the C.N.T., the syndicalist trade union organization, to have its two million members go to the polls. And the C.N.T. took that decision partly because a great number of the prisoners belonged to the C.N.T. Partly for that reason—but of that later.

THE WORKERS voted "left" to get their brothers out of prison; to help install a government that would treat them kindlier in their economic struggles; to stop the suppression of democratic rights; because times have been bad for the last two years. The more rhetorical among them repeated the battle cry of the liberal and radical lawyers and journalists. They said they voted to reconquer the Republic.

But Spain, in spite of its brisk development during the War and after, is an agricultural country, and some of the provinces are decidedly "clerical," priest-hypnotized. Well, the peasants were tired of living on grass during the last two lean years. 67% of the soil of Spain is owned by 2% of the population. The peasants want at least the Agrarian Reform Law voted by Azaña's Cortes some time ago. When the Law is applied, the peasants will be enabled to buy a little—very little—land from the present proprietors by pawning themselves to the government. It is not much of a land reform, but the peasants want land and believe promises, though two years ago they helped to turn out the very same Azaña because his government sent armed forces to kill peasants who attempted to take and use some of the large proprietors' land lying at the edge of their squalid villages. At Las Casas Viejas peasant families were assassinated in cold blood by Azaña's police. Azaña is now the banner of civil liberty and land reform.

FINALLY, BUSINESSMEN in Spain concluded that governments by men like Lerroux were corrupt and men like Gil Robles were phantastic bunglers. More democracy and liberalism may be the best thing for business.

So that in spite of all the efforts of the Monarchists and the Acción Popular, the "left" Republic won.

Efforts? Twenty days before the elections, Madrid was literally plastered with "right" placards which promised everything: a conditional amnesty, a "five-year plan," all improvements tending to public and individual ease and happiness. It is said that 34 million pesetas was spent by the "Radicals" (Lerroux, et al), the Acción, the Catalan League, Nationalist Basques, Traditionalists, Monarchists, Progresistas, etc., in a great combined effort to keep back the tide. Gil Robles was the recognized chief; the *Falange*, young blades, sons of the best families, wielding revolvers and canes, were the election bruisers. Neither the millions nor the revolvers were of any avail.

NOW AZANA, known to possess personal honesty, rules as a republican with the support of the Spanish Social-Democracy, which will most likely draw into itself the various Communistoid parties that have functioned for the last four years in the capacity of self-appointed, intransigent and distinctive "vanguards."

Even the rights have gone "left." Robles lost his post as the chief of the clerico-fascist Acción Popular. He was replaced by Sr. Jiménez Fernández, who because he is a fine outdoor speaker and has a demagogic appeal is called the "white Lenin."

The "white Lenin" is supposed to have stopped the post-election coup d'état of the N. M. E. (Unión militar española). According to rumors, the officers' organization decided to act on the night of the 18th of February. Gil Robles, blamed by the right for their defeat, called to his offices Jiménez Fernández and Miguel Maura, the chief of the conservative republicans. He told them that a military rising was going to take place in Madrid under the command of Generals Franco and Godet.

"INSANITY," cried Fernández. "If the officers budge, I predict a Saint-Bartholomew's night for aristocrats, monarchists and priests in all Spain. I shall have nothing to do with this affair. And you, Maura?"

"Don't count on me, Gil," replied Maura.

Gil Robles fainted in his armchair.

Maura ran outside and begged the military rebels to stop their plot. Then he got in touch with Azaña and procured in advance mercy for the two mutinous generals.

And now also Jiménez Fernández has become a republican. The new program of the Acción Popular will contain demands for vast social reforms, which are said to equal in appeal some of the best of the "proletarian vanguard" group proposals. It is as if after the sad, bad period of misunderstanding all politicians were going to get together in one republican family. But not so fast.

Besides hero Azaña there is hero Largo Caballero, the "militant" social-democrat leader, who two months ago had to appear before the Supreme Court of Madrid to answer the charge of participating in the Asturian troubles of 1934, with which he really had little to do, but who is at present given by his nearest companions the title of "liberator" of the 30,000 prisoners, with which he again had nothing to do.

I omit for the moment mention of Companys and his Catalan separatists. Neither have I time to deal at length with José Antonio Primo de Rivera's *Falange*, which will grow a bit as a result of defections from the clerical organization but has not the popular appeal to become the nucleus of a large fascist party. After all, the two important fascist parties in the world—Hitler's and Mussolini's—started as putative "labor" parties and were manned heavily with the declassed elements from the bankrupt middle strata of their countries. Rivera's followers are señoritos, rich young gentlemen. His group is known throughout the country as the rowdy organization of the well-to-do. It cannot possibly affect the demagogy of a mass fascist party.

NEITHER SHALL I stop here to consider at length the situation inside the C.N.T., by far the most important economic organization of Spanish workers. We have all heard the jubilation of the Socialist and Communist lawyers and journalists over the fact that the adherents of the C. N. T. went to the polls in February. The worthies were not so much touched by the fact that the syndicalist workers voted. For the same ladies and gentlemen, in their bohemian romanticism, assure us that nothing worth while may be won by voting. They said that even after the elections of February had left a good number of them salaried deputies.

What really made them rejoice was the increased hope that the C. N. T. was at last disintegrating and its component masses were looking around for professional leaders.

There may be some basis to that expectation. In this connection, we cannot pass by Pestaña, who for many consecutive terms was national secretary of the C. N. T., and after the institution of the republican regime in Spain, fathered a movement called "Treintismo," which attempted to change the "non-political" stand of the syndicalists. Expelled from the C. N. T. for wanting to inveigle the syndicalists into political action, he organized the Free Syndicalist Federation. And then in order to take part in the elections organized in 1934 his Syndicalist Party.

During the October uprising, the Syndicalist Party worked together with the famous Workers' Alliance, which included the Socialist Party, the U. G. T., the official Communist "paper" C. G. T. U., the Opposition Syndicalists (Peiró), Left-Wing Communists, Right-Wing Communists, etc.

The story is that the Socialist leaders supplied the arms, most of which was immediately confiscated by the authorities; that the Syndicalists (expelled and non-expelled) and the Socialist rank and file did the fighting (the workers always get killed); and then the Socialist lawyers and writers wrote from cover: "Hail, heroic, beautiful October! We shall not forget you."

BUT Pestaña himself was quite active in the October revolt. He is said to have had a hand in forming and proclaiming Catalá, free Catalonia, but denied it. His enemies, helped by the astute Lerroux, spread the rumor that soon after the October he had approached the then Premier with a nefarious scheme of having passports for every jack and woman of the Spanish population. Said Lerroux to the press: "Pestaña brought before me, as he had already done before the Department of the Interior, the very interesting project of identification cards for all citizens. For statistical purposes, it seems to me a very interesting and valuable undertaking." It was an obvious attempt to discredit Pestaña with the workers.

"The idea of the Syndicalist Party," explained Pestaña to an interviewer, "came to me after the fiasco of the industrial organizations (Syndicalist trade unions), which proved the complete futility of their activities. In the struggle between labor and the entrepreneurs, there arose certain problems to which one party found a solution, the other did not... The workers must not forget the victory of the 12th of April (the victory of the Republic). It proved that a real revolution can be accomplished without violence. We cannot reject this lesson... It showed us that a revolution triumphed when it received its impulse from political sources. We preached abstention from politics, but only a handful of workers heeded us. The majority of undecided workers went to the polls. When we consider the question in this light, it is useless to ponder over thought: 'From whom did we withdraw our votes?'"

Apparently from the Social Democrats. Especially from the fraction that calls itself "left" and is centered about Francisco Largo Caballero, a powerful speaker who carries on in the Spanish party the early Kautskyan "radical" tradition of Pablo Iglesias, the founder of the Spanish Social-Democratic organization.

Caballero was instrumental in organizing the 1917 General Strike. The more ignorant foreign correspondents call him the Lenin of the Spanish Revolution. It is true that Caballero's phraseology was always very "revolutionary" but he never showed actual opposition to the dominant "reformist" wing of the party. That does not mean to say that he will ever stop talking. A personality like Largo Caballero could under no circumstance permit himself

to stop talking. For the fact is that silence is not eloquent in politics.

Largo Caballero the "revolutionist" will be the advocate of certain necessary political reforms which both Azaña, the republican, and Prieto, the "Socialist reformist," want instituted. He will do no more. He is objectively the mouthpiece of the most progressive needs of the Spanish bourgeois State.

ABOUT CABALLERO, who harks back to the time and outlook of Guesde and the 1909 Kautsky, gather younger lawyers, journalists, poets, book reviewers and deputies, with a slightly different viewpoint, though they call Caballero their "leader."

The political position of the younger "Socialist" intellectuals is best expressed by Luis Araquistain. These people have nourished themselves on Kautskyism by the way of Lenin. They are now discovering the more solid parts of Marx, nibbling at those bits that seem to prove their viewpoint.

In brief, Araquistain and his admirers say that Spain will be the second country in which the socialist revolution will have triumphed. The first according to them was Russia. Confusing the political act of the progressive bourgeois revolution with the establishment of socialism, he avers that Marx and Engels erred when they declared that the socialist revolution would take place about the same time and in the most advanced countries, that "it will be a world revolution and must therefore have a world base" (F. Engels: *Elements of Communism*). Spain is like Russia, says Araquistain, and Russia like Spain. The late development of capitalism in each country. Both semi-feudal. October 1917 in Russia; October 1934 in Spain. Araquistain reproves Lenin for long believing in what Araquistain calls the "myth of the bourgeois-democratic stage." He reproves Lenin for taking so long to free himself from the "myth of the impossibility of socialism in one country." He says, "socialism does not need to be universal." Spain can have socialism within its borders next year.

For "in Spain are to be found now historic conditions extremely analogous to the Russia of the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century: a capitalism in its financial phase, the absence of a capable high bourgeoisie and the presence of a petty bourgeoisie that has no representative parties...; a weak State; a proletariat avid for power, conscious of its historic mission and a revolutionary capacity unequalled by any outside of Russia, and cured of all the illusions of democracy within the capitalist order."

Cured of all illusions of democracy—anarcho-syndicalists who yesterday decided to vote for the second time in their lives, and they voted for Araquistain and his less imaginative "reformist" brothers because they did not want to "throw away their votes."

As soon as Araquistain's socialism has been established in Spain, says Araquistain, there will be the problem of possible intervention. But "the U. S. S. R. will not permit the European States to intervene in socialist Spain."

WHEN WE EXAMINE what Araquistain calls socialism, we must agree that this kind of socialism may be built in Spain next month and the Powers will surely not intervene because unlike the authentic socialist revolution it cannot upset the world market and therefore will not inconvenience any national capitalism excepting as a "totalitarianized" rival. Araquistain says the will to accomplish his kind of socialist revolution is already abroad in Spain. The masses are ready; the only thing missing is a party to lead them. Why there is no such party at present though the masses are ready, he does not explain. The "ideological and revolutionary unification" of the existing Socialist Party will produce this organization of leaders.

It is apparent that with Araquistain as with most "communists" capitalism and socialism are names for kinds of government. They do not suspect, with Marx, that a social system does not necessarily change with the change of government, nor with the acquisition of new social sympathies by a government. Said Marx:

If it is true that the bourgeoisie "maintains politically (that is to say, with the help of its State power) the injustice of property relations" (an expression used by Heinzer), it is no less true that it does not create them. The origin of the injustice of property relations is in no way due to the political domination of the bourgeois classes. On the contrary, it is the domination of the bourgeoisie that flows from the existing production relations... For this reason if the proletariat overthrows the political domination of the bourgeoisie (in an industrially undeveloped country), the victory will only be a point in the process of the bourgeois revolution itself and will serve the purpose of the latter by aiding its ulterior development. Just as it did in 1794 and will again as long as the movement of history has not developed the material factors which will create the necessity of putting an end to the bourgeois method of production and in consequence to the political domination of the bourgeoisie. (*Literary Legacy*, vol. II, pp. 512-513, German ed.)

CAPITALISM IS CHARACTERIZED by a definite economic relationship between producer and product. Capitalism will be abolished in the measure that this relationship is done away with—in the measure that the prevalent means of livelihood ceases to be the sale of labor power. Socialism, for this reason, spells the unbalancing of the world market. So that only for economic causes a successful social revolution in one country is sure to sweep like a prairie fire into other countries.

Araquistain's "socialism" can live on peaceably side by side with the capitalist powers he is a trifle worried about, because big U. S. S. R., which also lives peaceably side by side with capitalism on the world market, will protect its smaller "socialist" brother. The fact is that Araquistain's kind of socialism may live peaceably side by side with capitalism because it is the same capitalism. State-managed capitalism.

The progressive bourgeois revolutions of the 20th century, occurring as they do in the epoch of late capitalism, talk "socialism." In the 18th and later in the 19th century, the French and German artisans and workers were inspired by the currently peddled ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity to sacrifice limb and life in the historic task of clearing the way politically for the fuller development of capitalism. Just so in the 20th century the promises of the immediate establishment of socialism in backward countries enlists the politically advanced workers and intellectuals to lose limb and life in the service of the delayed capitalist emancipation of their native lands.

And sometimes such a movement takes the form of what is today called fascism. It is quite possible that the Spanish masses will in time lend their support to offer of making direct use of the State in their favor. Such promises are usually posited on the establishment of economic self-sufficiency, and no political engineer of self-sufficiency will say he can build his "socialism in one country" or "autarchy" without the instrument of the totalitarian State.

NO, THE SPANISH fascist movement will not spring out of Rivera's *Falange*. It is more likely to find its first source in the Spanish Social-Democracy and wear shirts as red as Araquistain's necktie. We have the precedent of the very "revolutionary" Mussolini of before the war and the ultra-radical reformist program of the Fasci in 1919.

Translated by H. F.

David Frankfurter -- Murderer or Hero?

• E. Petrini

From "Le Réveil," Geneva, Switzerland.

WE SHALL discuss the action of this young student without any prejudice. He is not an anarchist. We have never been under the least suspicion of being in the remotest degree connected with him. We are not accused of helping to bring about his crime. Furthermore, we did not participate in the campaign of the Socialists and Communists for the expulsion of Gustloff from Switzerland, although we considered him a dangerous Nazi agent. We look with suspicion on all Governmental repressions which may at any time be arbitrarily extended. Our judgement, therefore, in this case more than in any other, is based entirely on our conception of "justice." To be precise, even though a few worries should result for us from the Davos affair, our whole-hearted sympathy would nevertheless go to David Frankfurter.

HOW OFTEN do we hear the question asked in different social spheres on hearing of the oppression suffered by the German people: "Is it possible that millions of men allow themselves to be scoffed at, emasculated, persecuted, deported—to say nothing of the savage beatings—and no resistance, no revolt?"

Well, here is one who resists, one who revolts, and those same

people, while they do not condemn him with the same ferocity they show towards the anarchists, find they must make prudent reservations. We make no reservations whatsoever.

The acceptance of degradation, of slavery and crime, which yesterday seemed monstrous to so many people, is in no way less monstrous today, so why condemn the man who has definitely refused to accept it? Let us be logical. Either you deny all rights to the individual, recognizing only an indefinable social right which would impose on each isolated man the duty to endure everything—or you find it right that some personality or some group give an example of what the people as a whole should do.

We fancy that we hear the objection: "Yes, but innocent people may be the victims." Well, first of all those innocent people are guilty of having made tyranny possible, and furthermore do they not accept day after day the bloody acts of that same tyranny? The axe is working overtime in Germany but we have seen no emotion displayed on this account in our bourgeois press. That press seems to regret only Frankfurter's revolver shots. The blood of all the Abels in the world is of no account. In fact, it seems predestined to be spilt, but on no account must a Cain be hurt.

L'OEUVRE, the great daily of the French Radical party, now in power, writes:

Certainly this crime is the crime of a Jew. It is about the first crime committed by a Jew after nearly three years of persecution the cruelty of which we know.

A deplorable and hateful crime no doubt—like all assassinations—and above all, one absolutely useless.

But, can we be astonished that a Jew should have experienced this reaction of exasperation? The passiveness of Israel is generally accepted as a historic rule, but like all other rules this one has its exceptions.

A crime? Hardly. During the Great War it was adjudged a glorious act to kill unknown men who had never been tyrants. The peoples who threw themselves against each other in 1914 did not do so after three years of persecution of a particularly cruel nature.

Why therefore "a deplorable and hateful crime"? Is it deplorable and hateful to strike at evil in the person of him who commits it? And why should it be "useless," if it awakens at last your slumbering sentiments, gentlemen of the press? Here at last is a "crime" you find worthy of consideration. Is that not precisely due to its significance?

The guillotine still performs its function in France, and as far as we know, the gentlemen of *L'Oeuvre* take no exception to it. But if death is to be the punishment for death, why reproach Frankfurter?

He was an exception to the historic rule of the passiveness of Israel. But has passiveness ever been considered a virtue? If not, then the exception must be so considered.

AND WE GET this from the Paris *L'Humanité*:

The gesture of the Yugoslav student will have the result of immediately accentuating the persecution of Jews in the Third Reich. The Nazi press so announced yesterday. And late in the evening a dispatch from Berlin announced that all Jewish cultural activities are prohibited in Germany till further notice, as a first reply to the shots of Frankfurter's revolver.

To be sure, action provokes reaction, but the German Communists, while they remained inactive, found themselves persecuted, tortured, "suicided." More than one of them had his head chopped off on the block. If every German Communist had been able to stand up against one Nazi, the fate of Germany today might be a little less tragic.

NO ONE COULD undertake to express the opinions of all the French labor organizations, but we shall quote that of *Le Peuple*:

Deplorable gesture, first of all because it will no doubt be the signal for further persecution of the half million Israelites who have been unable to leave the Reich; secondly because such a method of settling accounts cannot be admissible in any country still open to political refugees. The Swiss Government is not so well disposed towards liberalism as to make it advisable to furnish it with pretexts for further restricting the privilege of sanctuary.

Deplorable? Then perpetual resignation is the only thing not to be deplored. It is permissible to disagree with this. And as for the liberalism of the Swiss Government, we should not care to make a very arduous investigation of it, especially concerning political refugees. It is true that this liberalism exists, but only for Fascists.

SHOULD WE now present the opinion of the Socialists? It differs in no way from that of their allies, the People's Front, and therefore deserves no special remarks. Let us pass on to the opinions expressed by M. L. Savary, one of the intellectuals. After

establishing that Switzerland has no responsibility for the death of Mr. Gustloff, he adds:

That does not prevent the Swiss people from expressing the horror inspired by a political murder. We are accustomed to thinking here that quarrels of this sort do not necessitate the shedding of blood. Therefore, although the somewhat mysterious personality of Mr. Gustloff has been matter for considerable discussion, the press and public have been loud in their condemnation of the indefensible act of David Frankfurter. Only such people who would themselves wish to have recourse to the "Browning" to insure the triumph of their theories, could possibly find an excuse for him. We like to think they are only a negligible minority of professional agitators.

Such horror was certainly never expressed for the assassination of Worovsky, although Conradi was, not like Frankfurter, a person with an irreproachable private life. The Jewish student is found indefensible, whereas Conradi was excused by the jury at Lausanne. No one is more firmly convinced than we are that ideals cannot triumph through murder: but how can we forbid violence to the victims of violence? An ideology hunted by terrorism is in a state of legitimate defense against its persecutors. Professional agitators have nothing to do with the case of David Frankfurter. Mr. Savary then rambles on to no purpose whatever. However, let us follow him:

As in most dramas of this kind the murderer reasoned foolishly. It is true that in getting rid of Gustloff he struck at an active delegate of the régime he hated: but another will take his place, probably still more hostile to the Jews. For we have it on good authority that although Gustloff was a very zealous Nazi, he was not violently anti-Semitic like so many other National-Socialists.

The impulses to which men yield, in cases like this, when they are prompted by passion, cannot be reasonably discussed. Terrorists, nihilists, and such people believe they are doing a heroic act in assassinating a king, or an emperor—who will be succeeded by another king or emperor. "Fanaticism" defined means "imbecility."

ANYONE WHO cares may believe that, though Hitler has made anti-Semitism a cardinal point of his program, one of his most important agents abroad was not in the least hostile to Jews! Should not the reasoning which dissuades the oppressed from striking at their oppressors, apply also to oppressors in favor of the oppressed? Mr. Savary took care not to apply it to Mr. Dolfuss, the hangerman of the Austrian Socialists. A king or an emperor is succeeded by another king or emperor. Certainly. Is not a murdered revolutionist also succeeded by another? And would it therefore not be better to abstain from such fanaticism—the definition of which is "imbecility"—by not murdering the revolutionist? Justice is not justice unless it is equal for all, and its first rule is to exchange places. If this is not done, there is evidently a double justice, which is no justice at all.

In conclusion Mr. Savary writes on the liberty of the press:

We condemn, without exception, insults to foreign politicians, in fact to anyone. Honest journalism has no need of such weapons; while it makes use of irony and even severe criticism, it does not use abusive epithets. The duty of the Federal Council is to suppress abuses. On the other hand we rely on its wisdom not to attempt under any circumstances to restrain the liberty of the press, as such, even though newspapers do express opinions contrary to "the official truth."

AS FOR US, we shall never condemn calling a spade a spade and a knave a knave, even though he should be a foreign politician.

The clerical press of Switzerland made use of very violent language concerning French Radical officials, but nobody seemed to notice it. Telling Hitler or Mussolini the plain truth about themselves is abuse. But a bedizened charlatan as Commandant Jean-Renaud, may say at Geneva (*Le Piloni*, Nov. 29, 1935):

And I cry at the top of my voice to the Paul Boncourts and the Herriots, who have tied our hands, that there is still on the Place de la Concorde an open space for the erection of the guillotines of our National Revolution! (Bravos).
Had an anti-fascist directed such language to Italian or German Ministers, he would have been forbidden to reenter Switzerland. But a Fascist need not worry. Complete liberty of expression is accorded those whose dream is a regime with the most rigid "official truth."

But let us return to Davos.

ITALIAN and German fascisms have created a new situation in Switzerland, which we wish to stress. Fascism consists of the violent dissolution of all non-ruling parties so that the governmental party alone will carry on and thus become the State party. Moreover this State party, the official institution at home, attempts to impose itself as such abroad also, and to enjoy the prerogatives of consulates and legations. While the Swiss in Italy may never found a liberal, democratic or socialist association, the fascists attempt to organize themselves abroad into military formations, as though they were in their own country. And they do not hesitate to engage in propaganda against the Swiss form of government. Do not forget that their conceit was so overweening at Geneva that they even wished to interfere with gathering together of Swiss citizens and would decide what could and what could not be said at such gatherings. A well deserved lesson made them give up this attempt.

The fascists, mingling in inter-party quarrels, may find their members somewhat roughly handled, and then their diplomats protest as though they were duly accredited agents for the Swiss government. And Mr. Motta has condescendingly encouraged such pretensions.

In the Gustloff case, it will be remembered, the Chief of the Department of Justice and Police of the Canton of Saint-Gall wrote to him asking that he cease usurping official functions, and Gustloff made an insolent reply. We do not know how the difference was settled, but the Nazi agent must have gotten the better of the argument, since he remained here and carried on as before. At his death, both German and Swiss authorities treated him as

an official personage.

What we have said of the fascists is still more true concerning the "Fronts" in Germanic Switzerland. And all this takes place with the support of our own most ardent Nationalists, who claim "the right to be patriots" for the régimes of Rome and Berlin, which, however, have in view the subjection and subsequent dismemberment of Switzerland.

IF THERE IS one hopeless thing in this world, it is to see Right scoffed at and Justice trampled under foot. Despicable adventurers, thirsty for blood, become great Chiefs by means of the lowest treachery and turpitude, and before them the world bows, cringes and prostitutes itself. Their reign is a sequence of crimes and ruination; they push their countries and the whole world toward dire catastrophe.

What do men who have hearts and consciences do—those men whose humanity has not been entirely stifled? Well, they go on complaining indefinitely, absolutely powerless to erect even a fragile barrier against infamy triumphant. The utmost they can do is to resolve never to become voluntary accomplices of tyranny, but as a matter of fact they yield to all its exigencies and contribute to its existence.

Along comes an individual who says to himself: "As for me, I'll break rather than bend! Tyranny has me bound by terror. I shall repel this tyranny with the same terror." He does not hesitate at any of those learned political calculations which always end in submission. His back is tired from stooping. He rises in revolt as the representative of the human conscience, which can never limit its functions to a perpetual complaint.

With what do you reproach him, you who in your hundreds of thousands and millions have not yet been able to find and apply any remedy for crime—you who are ready to walk to any slaughter house, since no other route is conceivable except that of this individual revolt which you deplore? What do you affirm when you say that a dead king is succeeded by another king, if not your resignation to perpetual tyranny? What do you find criminal in a man giving of himself all that it is possible to give, even his life, and giving it for others?

A thousand times No! In the tragedy of David Frankfurter we see nothing senseless or criminal. He stepped forward to add himself voluntarily to the chain of victims of his race, knowing well that he could not break that chain. As for every victim, we should wish, with deep emotion, to clasp his hand.

Translated by Ann Bishop.

Will the Duce Be Shelved?

• Guissan

From "La Libre Belgique," Brussels.

IT WOULD BE excessive to affirm that the most influential Fascists of the "left" have prepared all the details of a plot for the transformation of the present regime. But their minds are made up on the principal lines of such a change.

As soon as the war has come to an end—and it is hoped it will terminate as a result of an acceptable deal—attempts will be made to impose on the Duce certain immediate reforms. These reforms will have as their aim the limitation of his dictatorial power. By what means? By setting in activity a real Parliament, possibly one chosen through universal suffrage, but at any rate a repre-

sentative body that will not be composed of the mannikins of the present Parliament. (This was written a few days before Duce's supposed suppression of the Chamber of Deputies and its replacement by the National Assembly of Corporations, which is, of course, still a Parliament, though dressed in a new guise to suit the new moves in the chess game played by Mussolini and his party rivals.) The Parliament could then exercise a serious control over the acts of the government. Finished will be the old song: "Mussolini is always right." If the Duce will want to keep his job, he will have to accept advice and hear criticism. He will have to renounce

his caprices, to adopt the solutions approved by the majority of the people, represented as formerly through its elected deputies.

A FRIEND OF MINE who participated in the last sessions of the Grand Fascist Council told me that he was astonished to see Mussolini keep quiet—for the first time since the establishment of the Fascist regime—while the former general-secretary of the Fascist Party, Farinacci, told him some hard truths in the midst of the silent assembly. The day after, Farinacci was not the only one to criticize. Other important party members, as Rossoni, Bottai, Acerbo imitated him. And I have just named the best known partisans of a constitutional metamorphosis.

Some among them are thinking of adding to parliamentary control a return to a retrieved, but nevertheless effective, liberty of the press. This reform is suggested by the daily spectacle of thousands of Italians refusing to read the newspapers of their country but preferring to read, especially in the Piedmont and Lombardy, foreign publications—French, Swiss, German—in which they expect to find authentic news on the war and the international situation, pretty well hidden by the Italian press.

THE MONARCHY constitutes a powerful factor in favor of the evolution of the regime. The prestige of the King has augmented since the beginning of the Ethiopian adventure. Those who speak of the early abdication of the king in favor of the heir-

presumptive are not acquainted with the new position that the king finds himself in. Without openly opposing the war at the time when the people as a whole seemed to be convinced of its necessity and legitimacy, he has shown a reserve and discretion commended by many Italians.

The army is with the king. Perhaps, one of the reasons that pushed Mussolini to make war was his desire to integrate the militia of his party—the Black Shirts—in the regular army. His attempt failed.

THE BLACK SHIRTS have proved in all the combats they took part in that there was nothing transcendental about their war value. The official chroniclers contest this truth. They try to emphasize the praise bestowed on the Black Shirts by Badoglio in his communiqués dealing with the battle of Enderta. The marshal is a wary fellow. After his past experience with fascism, he has decided to humor the militia as long as they will exist.

At any rate, more than ever before is the regular army separate from the army of the Fascist regime. This will facilitate the operation destined to render the country habitable for the great mass of Italians.

Is it because Mussolini himself considers this change to be inevitable that he has extended peace proposals to certain anti-fascist personalities? There may be something to that.

Condition of the Labor Movement in Belgium

• I. Mett

From "Révolution Prolétarienne", Paris

TO ANALYZE the activity of "National Renovation" government, we must first refer to the extraordinary congress of the Belgian Labor Party which took place immediately after the entry of the "socialists" into the government. This congress voted almost unanimously (excepting for some "left" opposition) its confidence in the party directorate and the government. Rereading the minutes of the congress, one sees that the leitmotif of all the speeches was the hope that the three-party government would solve the problem of unemployment. Thus, Bondas, one of the secretaries of the Trade Union Commission of Belgium, exclaimed: "Did not De Man get into the government, in order to do away with unemployment? Well, it seems that once in the government, he is making more of it." The delegate of the Federation of Borinage, Gollard, said the same day: "We must free ourselves from the tendency to justify a past attitude or to prepare another like it for tomorrow. Attention to the sufferings of the workers should take precedence at the present moment over all other considerations. We are going to give work to the unemployed. We are going to raise wages and the consumption level." And Max Buset, the editor of *Plan*: "I ask this congress to give a mandate to De Man so that he may be called, in a few months' time, the minister savior of the unemployed". Delattre agreed with this thesis: "The objective of the new government is putting the millions back to work." As for the father of the Plan and the future savior of the unemployed himself—his speech was at the same time pathetic and vain: "Buset said he wanted me to

become the minister of the unemployed. I hope I shall merit the honor. Soon, I hope, the author of the Plan and the minister of the unemployed will be one and the same person... We have a fixed idea: to do our utmost to put the unemployed of this country back to work. I should like to work with the slate of the workers. I shall light the lamp the miners gave me on Sainte-Barbe day every time there are ten thousand fewer unemployed."

WE SEE THAT the doing away with unemployment was officially the principal objective of the "socialist" sector of the three-party government. To what extent has this objective been attained ten months after the formation of the government?

We must remember that the "Holy Alliance" coalition began its activity at a moment that was favorable to a temporary economic rise. It was Spring and the International Exposition was about to open in Brussels. Thanks to the fall of the Belgian exchange, many foreigners were attracted. The visitors came not only to admire the Exposition but, in a large part, to profit by the devaluation of Belgian money. The same phenomenon was observed in other countries that experienced an analogous monetary situation. The visitors bought clothing, shoes, furs, etc. This whipped up small industry producing consumption goods. The Exposition itself made use of a numerous personnel, which had a favorable effect on the labor market of a small country like Belgium. But the reabsorption of unemployment did not make itself felt in any of the basic industries; for example, in Borinage, a region deeply struck by the crisis.

This temporary reabsorption was thus explained by honest observers, even if it was not so recognized by such eminent economists as the learned "minister of the unemployed."

What was the attitude taken by the P.O.B.—the Labor Party of Belgium—and its principal organ, *Peuple*, toward the monetary improvement?

It can be said, without exaggeration, that after the new ministry was formed, *Peuple* took on the airs of a government organ and began to manifest an optimism that was in flagrant contradiction with the misery of the Belgian workers. If its tone has become more modest of late, it is due to the ample evidence of the mediocrity of the results obtained.

Thus the *Peuple* of August 8 carried the following screaming strip:

In June 1935, for the first time in five years, the Belgian railways have made a profit. . . . From May to June 1935 unemployment has fallen by 15%.

On the 5th of October a new diminution of 4,000 unemployed was announced for the week of September 23 to 28 and, at the same time, a gradual fall of the expenses for relief from 95 to 43 million a month. Finally, in October 19, the number of the unemployed fell to 161,523 from the 199,931 that it reached in May.

ARE THESE FIGURES real? Do they correspond to fact, or have they merely been obtained by the magic maneuvers of the art of statistics? Many rumors spread among the workers. Some said that there was a considerable fall in unemployment, and it was due to a rigorous application of the insurance method. On the other hand the figures were contested by rather moderate officials of the Brussels trade union federation.

Meanwhile, the Exposition closed down, and the number of unemployed began to increase. Here are the figures given in *Plan*: "From October 28 to November 2, 1935, there were 157,331 unemployed. From December 24 to 28 there were 205,084. . . . Eight weeks annul the reabsorption of unemployment of the preceding 25 weeks."

The myth about the progressive diminution of unemployment was of some use to the government bloc. Behind the screen of glorious statistics, a great *coup* was being prepared: the budget for 1936 providing for a radical cut in relief. The prose the *Peuple* used on this topic is admirable:

The credit that was carried under this heading in the budget, and fixed to suit the present tendency in unemployment, can now be reduced—in view of the obvious amelioration of the situation and because, contrary to what happened in the past, it can be said to have a limiting character." (What does this mean?) . . . The reduction amounts to 100 million. We believe that this sum will be sufficient. (*Peuple*, Oct. 6.)

At present the reabsorption of the unemployed by industry has fallen to zero. At the same time, the funds allotted to relief have been cut. What will be done for the Belgian unemployed? Well, a scheme has already been put forward by the Central Industrial Committee (the Belgian Steel Trust) providing for the division of the unemployed into two categories. One group will consist of workers who have been longest without employment, that is, of those whose condition is most miserable. These are to be denied all unemployment relief.

HOW DOES the "savior of the unemployed" react to this situation? What is being done by his *Orec* (*Office du redressement économique*—Bureau of Economic Adjustment), which, according to Spaak, was going to do more for the unemployed than even the *Labor Plan* (*Plan du Travail*, the De Man Plan)? Well, this fine *Orec* is busy creating new myths. It continues to make beautiful

promises. It announces vast public works, for which, it has been said, there are on hand 3½ billion Belgian francs. The famous three and a half billion have been played up mightily by *Peuple* and De Man's political brothers. But it appears, according to the declaration made by the Minister of Finance at the Cabinet meeting of January 10, that of the 3½ billion there remain only a billion and 127 million. The public works in question have been discussed for a long time. They will never be started.

Meanwhile the "minister in shirt-sleeves" (De Man) does not remain idle. He is busy drafting all kinds of rules and regulations. He is trying to organize loans to prospective married couples for the purchase of furniture to feather their nests, which, he thinks, should aid the young unemployed to start their households and provoke at the same time the increase of production. And *Peuple* assures us that the last scheme derives directly from the fundamental theories of the Plan.

And the "socialist" minister does not forget his own reputation. The man whom Jules Romains called last year the greatest thinker of the socialist movement since Karl Marx, has requested to be given back his rank in the army. Thus the *Moniteur belge* (government organ), 30th of September, 1935:

The Minister of Public Works and Reabsorption of Unemployment, the reserve ex-lieutenant of infantry De Man H. is reintegrated, at his own request, keeping his grade and seniority, in the reserve of the army as of the 3rd day of February 1935. . .

Several days later the same government intelligence published:

Royal order no. 990, 30th of October, 1935: The cross of the Order of the Crown is given, in recognition of services rendered, to captain of the reserve 17,842 De Man H. of the 6th regiment of the line. . . .

Royal order no. 991, 30th of October, 1935: The War Cross, with palms is given to the captain of reserve 17,842 De Man H. of the 6th regiment of the line for courage and devotion shown during his long stay at the front. Royal order no. 992, 30th of October, 1935: The medal of a volunteer combattant 1914-1918 is given to the captain of reserve 17,482 De Man H., etc.

A Brussels journalist wrote: "Captain De Man has already 'absorbed' three decorations." We merely wonder whether we are dealing here with simple human baseness or the softening of Minister De Man's brain.

THE GOVERNMENT program planned to increase the general level of wages in case the retail price index rose. The official index has risen by 10% since devaluation and it continues to rise. The cost of living has risen even higher. But wages have not been increased.

The need of bringing wages back to, at least, the miserable level they had before devaluation, is extremely urgent. It has already caused several strikes in the country. Belgian wages were in the past among the lowest in Europe. What are they at present? Nobody can say where exactly they are at present. Brouckère in *Peuple* wrote recently: "In regards to wages, we are in greater ignorance than in the matter of prices. Is it known that the Minister of Labor lacks a general index of current wages?" According to Brouckère, the minister works on data supplied by the National Bank!

What part does Minister Delattre play in the struggle over wages? His is a pitiful role. He attempts to keep going the labor arbitration commissions, but the cases of employers' refusing to answer his invitations are numerous. The softness of the miner minister displeases the Trade Union Commission itself. On the

other hand, Delattre is perfectly satisfied with the results obtained. Speaking before the Labor Federation of Borinage, he said:

We have created a big enough number of arbitration commissions. But we cannot impose them on the employers. Wages have risen in most industries. In general, we have obtained satisfactory results.

There seems to be a wide difference of opinion between the Minister of Labor and the Belgian working class. This difference of opinion is made serious by the fact that the elections are near. With this in mind, the Labor Federation decided not to endanger the choice of Delattre to the primaries but will carry him as a "first" candidate (whose name is apparently not submitted in the regional primaries). The Young Socialist Guard of Jemmapes protested against this procedure, saying among other bitter things: "The manner of doing things suggests that the principal mandatory of Borinage is afraid of 'public evaluation of his activity.'" After a wave of protests, Delattre asked to have his name not to be withdrawn from the primaries. There is no doubt, however, that that Delattre is bound to be the MacDonald of Belgium.

THE QUESTION of labor organizations and the creation of boards of arbitration is one of the essential points in the program of the three-party government. To what extent has this part of the program been realized?

As observed above, Delattre has created numerous adjustment commissions. But the plan of incorporating the trade unions into the governmental organism and giving them a legal status, has not advanced very much. This is not due to any lack of willingness on the part of Delattre but to his incapacity, and also to a certain degree of opposition apparent in the ranks of the reformers themselves.

The question was debated at the trade union convention held at Ostend last December. Buset defended the idea of the legal status. He was quite prudent in presenting his viewpoint, but his stand was clear enough for those who could read between the lines. He tried to justify his position by the fact that a proposal of this kind had already been made by the Catholic ex-minister Heyman, whose project was inspired by what is now called corporatism.

Buset wants to have the present conciliationist trade union practice confirmed by law. He says: "We must not believe that a legal statute would open the way to corporatism." He proposes a law that would give the trade unions a civil personality, which would confer a juridic value on collective agreement.

An opposite point of view is presented by Louis de Brouckère. He points out that arbitration suppresses the collective agreement, for when a third party intervenes the first two parties do not try to reach an understanding. He emphasizes that the third party in question here is the capitalist State, which it is dangerous to consider as sovereign. Brouckère adds: "I find even in our ranks the cult of the impartial State." According to him, the contact of the proletariat with the State should be of the same order as with the employers.

It is hard to say which opinion finds more backing in the directing layers and functionaries of the Belgian Labor Party. However, trade union secretaries have been heard to state publicly that the real danger of Fascism does not flow from the existent nationalist-corporationist organizations but from the too close connection of the Labor Party with the capitalist State. We think that this opinion is well grounded.

WHAT HAS BECOME of the Socialist "Left" in view of these circumstances? Has it been able to regroup itself after the betrayal by its former leader? Has it succeeded in continuing the publication of its organ?

The first reaction of *Action socialiste* was quite praiseworthy. Soon afterward it began to defend the foreign policy of Stalin. This caused a scission in the editorial board. For some time, two different publications carried the same name. As a result of this, one of them took the name of *Action socialiste révolutionnaire*. It is edited by Walter Dauge, a young militant of Borinage, and is supported especially by several mining districts of the country. He has taken a clear cut anti-government and internationalist position and devotes some space to a criticism of Soviet policy. . . . At this time *Action socialiste révolutionnaire* is the only "class-struggle" organ existing in Belgium. It has a considerable influence on the workers of certain industrial regions. The movement it represents is far from being anti-parliamentary. Dauge himself is one of the Borinage candidates in the coming elections.

THE YOUNG SOCIALIST Guard seems to have broken down during the period we have just considered. It was not unanimously against entering the government, although its national secretary Godefroid declared himself, from the start, to be an opponent of the three-party combination.

We witnessed the parade of the Jeune Garde Socialiste as they demonstrated on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the P.O.B. They made an imposing appearance. Their ranks were made up of young workers of both sexes. The impression left was that J.G.S. is bound to become a malcontent element within the Labor Party of Belgium. When the young people passed the stands where the *bonzes* (the functionaries) were sitting, they shouted: "Give us our subsidy!" This had a very practical significance. The Belgian Party had given certain subsidies to the youth organization. But these were withdrawn in reprisal for the part played by the young socialists during the Basse-Sambre strike. While the government, including the Laborite ministers, ordered the use of tear-gas against strikers, the Socialist Young Guard passed out handbills calling for the support of the strike.

At the present time, an attempt is being made to inveigle the J.G.S. into a new spurt of activity in behalf of the De Man Plan. Will this be successful? Has human foolishness no limits?

And the proposal to lengthen the duration of military service—what will be the answer of the Socialist Youth to that? It seems certain that the Belgian Labor Party will not oppose the law on principle. On the contrary, it boasts of being the only party having at heart the defense of the country. In face of this, will the gulf between the two generations become wider or will it be bridged by a new, shameful compromise?

TEN MONTHS of the Holy Alliance government have brought the Belgian workers to a bad pass. The bourgeoisie comes out of it stronger economically and morally. The proletariat has had to pay the expense of the devaluation. It finds itself now in a state of moral disorganization.

This disproportion of strength appears especially dangerous in view of the gravity of the international situation.

Our hope is that the trade unions will save whatever remains of their independence and the youth movement will preserve at least a minimum of clear thinking.

Translated by Alfred Dutar

SEND US — SEND US

Names and addresses of prospective readers of "Ira"—International Review. We shall not mention your name—unless you insist. We shall write you a note of thanks.

Souvarine's "Stalin"

• Magdeleine Paz

From "Information Sociale," Paris.

TODAY NO ONE has the right to speak of the U.S.S.R., or venture an opinion of its present regime, without reading and reflecting on the masterly historic review of Bolshevism by Boris Souvarine.

The word "masterly" is not used in reference to Souvarine's manner of writing, though the author's style is absolutely simple and unadorned, his documentation monumental and the construction of this unusual book apparently faultless. What deserves especial admiration here is the intelligence of the writer. By uncovering, ranging and analyzing his facts, he succeeds in spreading before us a meaningful view of the past and present. Here is history with the warmth and tonality of actual life.

When the comprehension of history is carried to this degree, only the influence of the political situation suffices to make the appearance of such a book an event of international importance. For the last ten years we have witnessed a curious—and from the viewpoint of logic, inexplicable—phenomenon. The more the Russian Revolution has emptied itself of its revolutionary content, the greater has grown the attraction it has exerted on many people. The more of its vaunted substance has been lost, the more truly it has become a sort of magnetic field for a cohort of believers, mystics, flatterers, careerists, philistines and professional "followers".

On what is this enthusiastic adhesion founded? We shall not take into account now the wise people whose zeal is inspired entirely by practical considerations.

UPON EXAMINATION, we discover that it rests on the gooiest sort of emotionalism, complete ignorance and a stubborn will to believe. You look in vain for a desire to examine data, for clear sight, for the shadow of a suspicion of a knowledge of facts. Many, many times we have performed the experiment of putting questions to the fiery partisans who now turn toward the U.S. S. R. as to a Mecca. We have always observed that their faith was a religious faith, contemptuous of the scientific outlook and spurning historic truth.

But there is still another kind of believer, for it must be said that the contemporary defenders and worshippers of the Russian State are not recruited only from among snobs, small "red" profiteers and political illiterates. There are many people who have come to realize the irremediable bankruptcy of the capitalist system but who—as a result of their mental laziness, or because they cannot distinguish fact from appearances, or because they reverence the *fait accompli*, or because they unconsciously adore all seated power—expect reality to borrow and utilize for them the need for miracles still lurking inside themselves. In their desire for a social change, they yearn for a Christ, for a heaven, for a piece of land, for something to catch on to. They need a *something* that will answer their prayers. It would be awful if there were no response to their prayers. That *something* has become Russia. Deep Russia of the nebulous contours and amorphous vast masses, where Man works miracles, where in the dawn light shine several motor-words, several key-formulae, the mere mention of which slakes the thirst of the uninitiated, feeds their hunger for a better future and satisfies their most wistful dreams. Not one of them asks himself: "What is behind these words?" Not one

thinks of comparing theory with practice. Not one of them dares to look in back of the façade. No, the determination, enlisting in the best cases their entire existence, finds its spring in regions far removed from reason. Our time deserves to be called the Age of the Great Confusion.

TO ENABLE HIS READER to follow and understand the specifically Russian course of Bolshevism, Souvarine begins his account of Bolshevism with the 80's. The movement was not yet in existence but the way was already being paved for it by the development of events. He analyzes the conditions of the time, the geographic influences and the social milieu. So that the reader is present at the birth of the movement, walks with the men who incarnated it, is treated to an examination of its essential principles at the period of their crystallization, and then to the spectacle of the fight of the Bolsheviks against Tsarism, then their victory and accession to power.

The conquests of Bolshevism are enumerated, its achievements measured, its outlook described, its organizational forms carefully considered, its internal trends noted and the chiefs of the movement made familiar to us. Tracing the origin of Bolshevism, through his study of its actions and reactions, its functional mechanism and organic peculiarities, Souvarine brings out (spontaneously, one might say) the fundamental characteristics of the movement, its distinctive role in the social *mélée*.

The implacableness, vitality, energy and the unequalled tenacity and intransigence of Bolshevism when put together spelled heroism. Debased and diluted, these characteristics are still found in the never failing dynamism of the Communist parties of today. Alongside of these attributes the historian places another salient, specific feature of Bolshevism: its intrinsic, congenital amorality.

THIS WAS FIRST EXPRESSED in Niechaev's famous formula: "At full speed, right through the mud!"

Nobody will deny the existence of revolutionary ethics with their implication of an absolute overthrow, or at least transformation, of moral values. However, one expects this code of ethics, the new values, to spring from the mass. They can only be the product of the popular will. They must reflect popular aspirations. They must be a genuine people's creation.

Bolshevik amorality was introduced into the living mass violently, a foreign body. Little by little it came to fit the old aphorism: "The end justifies the means."

The latter has meaning in so far as it represents the interests of the working class, and therefore coincides with the general interests of humanity. It has meaning in so far as the media used are subordinated to the end aimed at. But there is the danger that the means will substitute themselves for the goal and create their own status quo...

From the viewpoint of social progress, Bolshevik amorality is only of relative importance. Bolshevik amorality takes on importance as soon as it begins to influence the labor movement and gives rise to a flagrant disparity between intention and reality. When a party tries to win the supremacy of the movement "any way at all", and often as a result of lying and disloyalty to the class, then the means may be said to bar the road to the attainment

of the goal.

Souvarine recalls that Lenin invented the phrases "com-lie" ("com-mensonge") and "com-brag" ("com-vantise") to describe two specific tendencies of his Communists. "I hear all around me," he said, "so many sugared Communist lies, so many com-lies, that I sometimes feel painfully sick at the heart."

The "com-lie", at first only an irritating habit, acquired later the force of an institution. It became a system of government.

Another distinctive quality of the present regime flows from the traditional Bolshevik stand on the role and makeup of the party. In accordance with Lenin's (and before him Niechaev's) ideas, Bolshevism constituted organizationally a grouping of professional revolutionists, whose material needs were assured by the resources of the party. (As a rule, the funds gotten by assessments and dues were insufficient. Therefore the party funds were sometimes increased by means of bold "expropriations"). The party outlook called for a selection of specially trusted men, principally intellectuals, whose general and sociological culture fitted them to handle and solve the most complex immediate problems. It called for men who were masters of the "art of revolution," ever ready to sacrifice liberty, private interests, life in the service of the Revolution.

This attitude contributed powerfully to the success of October. Souvarine writes: "The Bolsheviks had the advantage over the other revolutionary parties in that they aimed resolutely at power and used everything on hand to obtain it."

WHAT HAPPENED WHEN the principal personage of the movement died? We recall Marx's whimsy: "I have sowed dragons and harvested fleas."

The personnel of professional revolutionaries who, around Lenin, constituted "the old Bolshevik guard," and which was undoubtedly an élite, was metamorphosed by force of circumstances into a monstrous and tentacular bureaucracy leading a parasitic life in the name of Marxist principles.

So that there was a flaw in Lenin's scheme, or rather a fissure, a crack, through which could make their way shrewdness, intrigue, personal dictatorship, aided by perseverance, an aptitude for "practical work," a limited horizon, military firmness, baseness of character, executive automatism and docility before authority. Through that crack Stalin eased himself in.

Boris Souvarine has done well to choose Stalin as the individual, personal embodiment of Bolshevism. Against the background of his larger study, he has drawn a meticulous portrait of the "genius-leader." Here is the prototype of the typical bureaucrat, devoid of the ability to think independently, lacking all the qualities that go to make up the highest grade of individual, retaining only the letter of his party doctrine, knowing no other law than loyalty to the victorious group, having no other characteristic of genius than that of patience, no other skill than intrigue, possessing a fist for a brain, a mask for a face and seeing humanity as a checkerboard with pawns to move over.

We must not conclude, however, suggests Souvarine, that Stalin and his kind had worked the change in the political situation in Russia merely by their own personality.

ALREADY DURING the heroic period of Bolshevism, the "inner circle of leaders" found themselves (by party definition) separated from the membership. Already in those fine days the party functioned in such a manner that every discussion of theory and practice was finally decided by the most influential member of the inner circle. Among the Bolsheviks of the first zone it was Lenin who exercised a sort of "arbitrary magistracy." His character offered a solid guarantee against purely personal domination on

his part. Even after the seizure of power, the stated aims of the Revolution seemed secure as long as Lenin remained alive. The inner circle was more or less reduced to the role of a transmitting agent. The difficulties and dangers facing them were too great. They could not act otherwise.

However, even before Lenin's death, there rose that pyramidal organization which little by little put all power into the hands of a single person. Over the people was the party. Over the party, the Central Committee. Over the C. C., the Politbureau. Over the Politbureau, the Secretariat, that is, one man "holding all threads in his fist."

THE DAY AFTER OCTOBER, the Bolshevik Central Committee started to supplant both the Executive Bureau of the Soviets and the Council of People's Commissars. In the same way, the C. C. stopped to exist in fact. Meeting rarely, it came to serve as a nominal agency for registering the decisions of the Politburo.

Quite early the local committees of the Communist Party substituted themselves for the executive committees of the local Soviets. Contrary to the initial promises of the Bolsheviks, the functionaries—neither elected nor responsible to the people—formed a "hierarchy of secretaries", a privileged social caste. There were 800,000 chinovniks (functionaries) in Tsarist Russia. They numbered 5,000,000 in the Russia of 1930.

Amidst the general want, these worthies were the only persons to possess some perspective of a future, the only ones to enjoy some certainty of income, lodging and food. At every level of the political, economic and administrative structures, the government institutions were subjected to the corresponding Communist organs. The party superimposed itself on the State, encroached on its privileges and finally stripped the popular State of all constitutional prerogatives. As Bukharine remarked, before he became a good boy, the party put itself "above everything". We stand here before "the superimposition of an abstraction which tapers into a tangible reality." That much was foretold by Plekhanov. "In the end", he said, "everything will turn with them about one man, who, *ex providentia*, will gather unto him all

THE CHANGE WAS NOT a brusque about-face. It did not arrive in accordance with a preconceived plan. It was not even entirely understood by its beneficiaries. It was essentially the triple effect of the general backwardness of the population, the apathy of the tired masses and the endeavor of the Bolsheviks to master the revolutionary and post-revolutionary chaos.

Was there nobody to remind the managers of the Russian State of their original fine resolutions?

Too late. The Khozain—the Boss—had got there first. His heavy hand lay on all the master levers. He became the center of a huge machine, which he could set in motion with a nod of the head. He disposed of the army, press and the police. And what police! With the greatest of ease, he could make and unmake Congresses, obtain unanimous votes and "monolithic" resolutions, persecute, repress and send opponents to Siberia or prison. He became the master.

Circumstances favored him. The "apparatus" was not in the position to challenge him. It could not permit itself to have its reason for being questioned. In a country where the citizen's entire life—his work, wages, lodging, food, everything, in fact—depends on submission to the existing powers, one must be a hero to sacrifice occupation, salary, daily bread and liberty to an idea, dragging along one's family into misery and possible exile.

But heroes were not lacking. Numerous "oppositions" arose. They were diversely led, based on postulates that were more or less identical, but were differently formulated, and they operated in-

dependently. These were destroyed one by one, Trotsky's among the rest. Some of these oppositions were overcome by catering to the material interests of the leaders. They who could not be reduced this way were suppressed by terror. There were and are "isolated" prisons, deportation camps, and unhealthy islands for socialists, syndicalists, anarchists, tolstoyans and non-conformist communists. ..

THE MISTAKE OF THESE oppositions—of all the Soviet oppositions—was not to have struck at the root of the evil. The supreme evil was the absence of democracy. No oppositionist group had thought of posing what was really the first question, conditioning all other, the question of democracy.

Moreover, though they were honest and sincere, the oppositionists did not measure up to the exigencies of an effective struggle against Stalin's "means". Besides open state coercion, they had to suffer the whip of the "com-maneuvre." Their intentions were deformed. Alien viewpoints were imputed to them. They were robbed of the very ideas for which they were condemned. We know the procedure. Stalin is not an innovator in the art.

Boris Souvarine shows that the defeat of the opposition (particularly Trotsky's) was especially due to their half-measures, their political naiveté and lack of skill as political intriguers. Experience told them that the essential cause of the state of affairs they denounced lay in the fact that the Party was "above everything," alien to the life of the country, cut away from the masses, and yet exercising over the latter a pitiless dictatorship. They, nevertheless, continued to place the Party above everything. They knew that the Party was reduced to a form, that it was deprived of the possibility of expressing itself freely and deciding its course. They had no doubts about its subjection. Yet they appealed to the Party. . . Kneeling before the fetish of the Party, they permitted themselves to be nailed to the pillory, to be exterminated or deported. They left the field free to Stalin and his *cotérie satisfaite*, the glad gang, who continue to gargle revolutionary phrases while pursuing their practical, business course.

SOUVARINE CONCLUDES that Bolshevism has seen its day. Its doctrine, an approximative Russian version of Marxism, will, according to him, never be more than a "theology weighed down with dogma, mysticism, and a scholastic method of reasoning."

There remain today of the Bolshevism of the heroic period, mostly words, literature of one sort or another, inscriptions on monuments, citations in speeches and articles, "Leninist" protestations in the mouth of officials, topics of university and party theses and finally the subject matter of much poetry and fiction.

"WHAT IS THE OUTSTANDING characteristic of the present Soviet regime?" asks Souvarine. It is the flagrant contradiction between theory and practice, the dazzling contrast between published principles and facts, the basic opposition of appearances and reality. The worst renouncements, the most tragic failures, are accomplished in the name of the revolution and hailed as revolutionary advances. The old vocabulary remains good currency.

Lenin defined the Republic of Soviets as "a new type of State, devoid of bureaucracy, police and a permanent army." According to Souvarine, these grand phrases seem laughable when one considers the power and dimensions of the present pillars of this republic—that is, the bureaucracy, police and army.

Of the original Bolshevik program, doctrine, pretensions and promises, there is nothing that has not been abused, betrayed, contradicted by reality as it presents itself today. Souvarine does not limit himself to illustrate and 'give proof to his contention. He

marshals his facts, drawing what appears to be an irrefutable conclusion from a plethora of figures, observations, speeches, historic events, always gathered from official Soviet sources.

This will, of course, not stop certain people from charging him with prejudice. However, it is evident that with the exception of two chapters, where the pamphleteer comes to the fore, the work is marked by an impeccable objectivity. Neither for nor against, the historian remains serenely occupied with the task of shedding light on events and tracking down consequences.

BUT WE ALREADY hear an objection:

"Here is a book that concludes that the Soviet State has failed, that the promises of October have been renounced or forgotten. You praise the work and recommend its wide reading at a moment when it is imperative to mass all forces—worker and republican—in opposition to the threat of fascism! This is not the time to criticize. It is the time to work. This is not the time to search for mistakes thru a microscope. Mistakes? The very talk about mistakes means division. The hour has struck for getting together, for unity."

We answer in all tranquility that if unity can only be consummated by fooling the mass, that which you will get as a result of this will be the unity found in cemeteries.

If the customary jousting with citations from Lenin did not weary us somewhat of the usual cliché "Leninism," we should be tempted to say with Lenin:

"Before uniting and in order to unite, we must distinguish ourselves."

Unity for the sake of unity has no meaning. Unity in the dark; unity served by lies; unity arrived at through the mechanization and shuffling of the masses; unity built on the rejection of theory, on the contempt for human beings developed into a system, on bluff raised to a supreme law,—that is the unity which will make possible the continued subjection of the working class and set back the world movement for emancipation.

TO REFUSE TO LEARN from the past and present, to consider experience worthless, to fear the truth—as bitter as it may be,—to go to the battle with bandaged eyes, to take time for circum-spect—that is, tantamount to capitulation.

From the mass of facts presented in Souvarine's book, we can draw important conclusions and several simple general ideas. These are so simple that they seem banal. But theirs is a cardinal simplicity, which possesses such a vital importance that, we may say, that by slighting them the present rulers of Russia "have bartered, in exchange for the opportunity to survive in power, every socialist reason for existence." Souvarine ends his book by recalling an old notion: "Socialism is impossible without democracy."

Every person to whom the problems of the Revolution are neither matters of professional routine nor a dilettante's sport ought to read this book.

Translated by R. Mandier

RACE PURITY

We regret to observe that Jewish clothing stores still believe they are permitted to give their mannikins in the show windows heads with Aryan features. We propose that all commercial and professional organizations of the Reich be vigilant and insist that from now on Jewish clothing stores provide their mannikins with heads having Semitic features.—"Der Stürmer", Nuremberg.

Trade Unions, "Social Control", Socialism

• Rosa Luxemburg

This is the fourth chapter of "Reform or Revolution." The first complete English translation is being reproduced serially in this publication.

BERNSTEIN REJECTS the "theory of collapse" as an historic road toward socialism. Now what is the way to a socialist society that is proposed by the "theory of the adaptation of capitalism?" Bernstein answers this question only by allusion. Konrad Schmidt, however, attempts to deal with this detail in the manner of Bernstein. According to him, "the trade union struggle for hours and wages and the political struggle for reforms will lead to a progressively more extensive control over the conditions of production," and "as the rights of the capitalist proprietor will be diminished through legislation, he will be reduced in time to the role of a simple administrator." "The capitalist will see his property lose more and more value to himself" till finally "the direction and administration of exploitation will be taken from him entirely" and "collective exploitation" instituted.

Therefore trade unions, social reforms and, adds Bernstein, the political democratization of the State are the means of the progressive realization of socialism.

But the fact is that the principal function of trades unions (and this was best explained by Bernstein himself in the *Neue Zeit* in 1891) consists in providing the workers with a means of realizing the capitalist law of wages, that is to say, the sale of their labor power at current market prices. Trade unions enable the proletariat to utilize, at each instant, the conjunctures of the market. But these conjunctures—1. the labor demand determined by the state of production, 2. the labor supply created by the proletarianization of the middle strata of society and the natural reproduction of the working class, and 3. the momentary degree of productivity of labor—are outside of the sphere of influence of trade unions. That is why trade unions cannot suppress the law of wages. Under the most favorable circumstances the best they can do is impose on capitalist exploitation the "normal" limits of the moment. They have not, however, the power to suppress exploitation itself, not even gradually.

SCHMIDT, it is true, sees the present trade union movement in a "feeble initial stage." He hopes that "in the future" the "trade union movement will exercise a progressively increased influence over the regulation of production". But by the regulation of production we can only understand two things: intervention in the technical domain of the process of production and fixing the scale of production itself. What is the nature of the influence exercised by trade unions in these two departments? It is clear that in the technique of production, the interest of the capitalist accords, up to a certain point, with the progress and development of capitalist economy. It is his own interest that pushes him to making technical improvements. But the isolated worker finds himself in a decidedly different position. Each technical transformation contradicts his interests. It aggravates his helpless situation by depreciating the value of his labor power and rendering his work more intense, more monotonous and more difficult. In so far as trade unions can intervene in the technical department of production, they can only oppose technical innovation. But here they do not act in the interest of the entire working class and its emanci-

pation, which accords rather with technical progress and, therefore, with the interest of the isolated capitalist. They act here in a reactionary direction. And in fact, we find efforts on the part of workers to intervene in the technical part of production not in the future, where Schmidt looks for it, but in the past of the trade union movement. Such efforts characterized the old phase of English trade-unionism (up to 1860), when the British organizations were still tied to medieval "corporative" vestiges and found inspiration in the outworn principle of "a right acquired for suitable work", as expressed by Webb in his *Practice and Theory of English Trade Unions*.

ON THE OTHER HAND, the effort of labor unions to fix the scale of production and the prices of commodities is a recent phenomenon. It is only since a short while ago that we have witnessed such attempts—and again in England. In their nature and the active participation of trade unions in fixing the scale and tendency, these efforts resemble those dealt with above. What does cost of production amount to? It amounts to the union of the workers and entrepreneurs in a common stand against the consumer and against rival entrepreneurs. In no way is the effect of this any different from that of ordinary employers' associations. Basically we no longer have here a struggle between Labor and Capital but the solidarity of Capital and labor power against the ensemble of the consumers. Considered for its social worth, it is a reactionary move, which cannot constitute a stage in the struggle for the emancipation of the proletariat because it connotes the opposite of the class struggle. Considered from the angle of practical application, it is a utopia which, as shown by a rapid examination, cannot be extended to the large branches of industry producing for the world market.

So that the activity of trade unions is limited essentially to a struggle for an increase of wages and the reduction of labor time, that is to say, to efforts at regulating capitalist exploitation as they are made necessary by the momentary situation of the world market. But labor unions can in no way influence the process of production itself. Moreover, trade union development moves—contrary to what is asserted by Konrad Schmidt—in the direction of a complete detachment of the labor market from any immediate relation to the rest of the market.

This is best shown by the fact that even attempts to relate labor contracts to the general situation of production by means of a system of sliding wage scales have been outmoded with historic development. The British labor unions are moving farther and farther away from such efforts.

EVEN WITHIN the effective boundaries of its activity the trade union movement cannot spread in the unlimited manner that is claimed for it by the theory of adaptation. On the contrary, if we examine the large factors of social development, we see that we are not moving toward an epoch marked by the victorious development of trade union strength but rather toward a time when the hardships of labor unions will increase. *Once industrial development has attained its highest possible point and capitalism has entered its descending phase on the world market, the trade union struggle will become doubly difficult.* In the first place, the objective conjunctures of the market will be less favorable to the

sellers of labor power. *For the demand for labor power will increase at a slower rate and the labor supply more rapidly than is the case at present. In the second place, the capitalists themselves, in order to make up for losses suffered on the world market, will make even greater efforts than at present to reduce the part of the total product going to the workers (in the form of wages).* The reduction of wages is, as pointed out by Marx, one of the principal means of retarding the fall of profit. The situation in England is already offering us a picture of the beginning of the second stage of trade union development. *Trade union action is reduced necessarily to simple defense of already realized gains, and even that is becoming more and more difficult.* Such is the general trend of things in our society. *The counterpart of this tendency should be the development of the political side of the class struggle.*

KONRAD SCHMIDT COMMITS the same error of historic perspective when he deals with social reforms. He expects that social reforms, just as trade union organizations, will "dictate to the capitalists the only conditions under which they will be able to employ labor forces". Because he sees reform in this light, Bernstein calls labor legislation a piece of "social control", and as such, a piece of socialism. Similarly, Konrad Schmidt always uses the term "social control" when he refers to labor protective laws. And once he has thus happily transformed the State into society, he confidently adds: "That is to say, the rising working class". As a result of this trick of substitution, the innocent labor laws of the German Federal Council become transformed into transitory socialist measures supposedly enacted by the German proletariat.

The mystification is obvious. We know that the present State is not "society" representing the "rising working class". It is itself the representative of capitalist society. It is a class State. Therefore its reform measures are not an application of "social control", that is, the control of society working freely in its own labor process. They are forms of control applied by the class organization of Capital over the production of Capital. The so-called social reforms are enacted in the interests of Capital. Yes, Bernstein and Konrad Schmidt see at present only "feeble beginnings" of this control. They hope to see a long succession of reforms in the future, all in favor of the working class. But here they commit a mistake similar to that contained in their belief in the unlimited development of the trade union movement.

A BASIC CONDITION for the theory of the gradual realization of socialism by means of social reforms is a given objective development of capitalist property and of the present State. Konrad Schmidt says that the capitalist proprietor tends to lose his special rights with historic development and is reduced to the role of a simple administrator. He thinks that the expropriation of the capitalist means of production cannot possibly be effected as a single historic act. He therefore resorts to the theory of expropriation by stages. With this in mind, he divides the right to property into 1. the right of "supreme property" (ownership)—which he attributes to a thing called "society" and which he wants to extend more and more—and into 2. its opposite, the simple right of use, held by the capitalist but dwindling away to the mere administration of their enterprises by the erstwhile private owners.

This interpretation is either a simple play on words, and in that case the theory of gradual expropriation has no foundation; or it is a true picture of juridical development; and in that case, we shall see, the theory of gradual expropriation is entirely false.

The division of the right of property into several component rights, which serves Konrad Schmidt as a shelter where he may construct his theory of "expropriation by stages", characterized feudal society, founded on natural economy. In feudalism, the

product was shared out among the social classes of the time on the basis of the personal relations existing between the feudal lord and his serfs or under-farmers. The decomposition of property into several partial rights reflected the manner of distribution of the social wealth of that period. With the passage to the production of commodities and the dissolution of all personal bonds among the participants in the process of production, the relation between men and things (that is to say, private property) became reciprocally stronger. Since the division is no longer made on the basis of personal relation but by means of exchange, the different rights to sharing in the social wealth are no longer measured as fragments of property rights having a common interest. They are measured now according to the values brought by each on the market.

The first change introduced into juridical relations with the advance of commodity production in the medieval city communes, was the development of absolute private property. It appeared in the very midst of the feudal juridic relations. This development has progressed at a rapid pace in capitalist production. *The more the process of production is socialized, the more the process of distribution (division of wealth) rests on pure exchange.* And the more private property becomes inviolable and closed, the more capitalist property becomes transformed from the rights to the product of somebody else's labor. As long as the capitalist himself manages his own factory, distribution is still, up to a certain point, tied to personal participation in the process of production. But as the personal management on the part of the capitalist becomes superfluous—which is the case in the share-holding societies today—the property of capital, so far as its right to share in the distribution (division of wealth) concerned becomes separated completely from any personal relation with production. It now appears in its purest form. *The capitalist right to property reaches its most complete development in capital held in the shape of shares and industrial capital.*

So that Konrad Schmidt's historic schema tracing the transformation of the capitalist "from a proprietor to a simple administrator" belies real historic development. In historic reality, the capitalist tends to change from a proprietor and administrator to a simple proprietor. What happened here to Konrad Schmidt, happened to Goethe:

What he has he sees as in a dream.

What is no longer becomes for him reality.

And just Schmidt's historic schema travels, economically, backwards, from a modern share-holding society to an artisan's shop, so he wishes to lead back, juridically, the capitalist world into the old feudal shell of the Middle Ages.

ALSO FROM THIS POINT of view, "social control" appears in reality under a different aspect than as seen by Konrad Schmidt. What functions today as "social control"—labor legislation, the control of industrial organizations through share holding, etc.—has absolutely nothing to do with his so-called "supreme ownership". Far from being, as Schmidt believes, a reduction of capitalist ownership, his "social control", is on the contrary, a protection of such ownership. Or, expressed from the economic viewpoint, it is not a threat to capitalist exploitation, but simply the regulation of this exploitation. When Bernstein asks if there is more or less of socialism in a labor protective law, we can assure him that, in the best of labor protective laws, there is no more "socialism" than in a municipal ordinance regulating the cleaning of streets or the lighting of street lamps.

Translated by O. G.

WAR: A NEW SOCIAL ORDER

From "Deutsche Wehr," Berlin.

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY will be called by the historians of tomorrow the century of war. This appellation will be less founded on the effective number of great wars that will take place during our century than on the decisive and fundamental transformation that war will undergo as a phenomenon of human life.

Formerly, and especially during the bourgeois epoch (which is coming to a close in our time), war signified an interruption, an incident in pacific life. Importance was attributed to it in so far as it affected the cessation or the reestablishment of normal conditions.

This conception has undergone a radical transformation since the catastrophe of 1914. War no longer appears as a simple accident, without special importance of its own. It has emancipated itself completely from a humanity which believed it could, if not suppress it completely, at least subject it to its laws. War constitutes from now on a phenomenon possessing its special character and its own law. It has now an independent existence and as much value as peace.

A NEW WORLD has been born, a "counter-world," in which war is the premise and measure of all things and its representative, the military man, is to be master and legislator. While formerly people tried to integrate war in the pacific order of things, the contrary is becoming true now. It is peace which has to submit to the exigencies of war, the occult master of the century. Peace has now fallen to the level of a simple armistice.

This emancipation of war constitutes the dominant event and characteristic of our epoch. And it calls now, to make possible its completion, for a last, decisive step: the replacement of a social order based on the principle of peace by another order, adopted to the special needs of war. The creation of a social constitution of war is the specific task of our time. In the following lines, we shall try to sketch the solution.

The project of a social constitution of war must begin with the presentation of the part dealing with its *personnel*,

that is to say, with the establishment of a social order of *total war*. This term already defines clearly the nature of the social order in question. That is to say, corresponding to the task that it will have to accomplish, this order must first of all be totalitarian. Whatever are its forms of existence and their multiplicity, it must serve entirely the domination of a supreme and unitary principle. This all-dominating principle is *war*. All activity in the framework of the society so conceived must therefore serve, in one way or another, the needs required to set in motion and execution the war.

FURTHERMORE, the social order of the total war connotes a society where, by principle, each citizen will be a functionary working directly for the ends of the war. In that connection, we may indicate that the conception of this society must in no way be interfered with by ideas dating before 1914. *Totality* of mobilization and the execution of the war does in no way signify that, besides the military, this or the other section of the population is mobilized for the needs of the war. *Totality* of war means that as soon as war breaks out, private life ceases to exist. For the totality of the nation, in the fullest sense of the word, war and its execution becomes the only reason for its existence. Then it is no longer permissible to speak of a *civil* population, in any form or in any case whatsoever.

But that is not all. Total war claims from the citizen his entire being, not only his exterior activity. All the intellectual and moral forces of the individual are mobilized and placed at the service of the single and supreme end. The moral idea of "service" must dominate everything. And for the functionary of the new society, war will not be only an occupation. The idea of war will have to fill him entirely. It will have to be his exclusive preoccupation, leaving no room for any other thought. It will become his great passion, his only pleasure, his vice, his sport: a veritable monomania.

Translated by O. G.

Subscription Order Blank

International Review

P. O. BOX 44, STA. O., NEW YORK CITY

RATES: Yearly: U. S. A. \$1.50; Canada and Foreign \$1.75.

8 mos.: U. S. A. \$1.00; Canada and Foreign \$1.25.

Please send monthly issues,
beginning with
I enclose \$

Send bill

Name

Address

Also send copy of INTERNATIONAL REVIEW to

Name

Address

THREE-CENTS-A-WORD

ADVERTISEMENTS will be accepted in this column for any sort of communication: expressions of opinion (limited to twenty lines), personal services to let or required, ideas for sale, the quest for friends and friendship, etc. All advertisements must be approved by the International Review. Yes, rates are 3 continental pennies a word, including signature. Payment must be received ten days before date of publication. Address Three Cents a Word Dept., International Review, P. O. Box 44, Sta. O, New York City.

MODERNE DEUTSCHE Buchhandlung, 250 E. 84th St., Regent 41522, N. Y. C. The latest German exile periodicals. Books, recent and classics.

ITALIAN TRANSLATOR wanted to collaborate in interesting work. Address A. M., 3c-a-Word Dept., International Review

CORRESPONDENCE SOUGHT, English, French, Spanish. Serious. Man or woman. E. S., 3c-a-Word Dept., International Review.

VISITING NEW YORK CITY. Walking, talking companion wanted. Preferably man college student interested in music and theatre. Address Young Lady, 3c-a-Word Dept., International Review.